

## The Social Context of the “Outsider Woman” in Proverbs 1–9

### I. Solomon and the Problem of Exogamous Marriage

As the title “the Proverbs of Solomon, Son of David, King of Israel” indicates, the wisdom inculcated in Proverbs 1–9 is royal wisdom, and specifically the wisdom of Solomon. The narrative tradition about Solomon speaks of that wisdom as a quality divinely bestowed, one which conferred administrative and judicial skill, encyclopedic knowledge and literary expertise (1 Kgs 3,5-14.16-28; 5,9-14.26), and of this we are reminded from time to time in these chapters (e.g. Prov 8,15-16). The same narrative tradition faults Solomon only in one respect, namely, his addiction to foreign women (*nāšīm nokriyyôt* 1 Kgs 11,1-8). The narrator adds that his attachment to them, either as wives or harem women, was in violation of the law, and the outcome was that they “turned away his heart” by inducing him to adopt the cults of their deities (1 Kgs 11,9-13). It is therefore not surprising that in a composition attributed to Solomon the foreign woman (*’iššāh nokriyyāh/zārāh*) presents the greatest obstacle to the acquisition of wisdom by virtue of her association with non-Yahwistic cults. The title therefore justifies us in reading Proverbs 1–9 as a cautionary instruction of Solomon based on his own experience.

In taking Solomon to task for this one aberration, the historian cites the law in question a law forbidding intermarriage between Israelites and foreigners, the purpose of which was to avoid the adoption of alien cults. We find such a law, with the same rationale, in Deut 7,1-4, and it would be natural to assume that this is the law to which the narrator is referring in speaking of Solomon’s marriages. But while the general drift of the respective formulations is identical, the wording is quite different:

*lo’-tābo’û bāhēm* (1 Kgs 11,2) cf. *lo’ tithattēn bām* (Deut 7,3)

*yīṭṭû ’et-l’bābkem* (1 Kgs 11,2) cf. *yāsir ’et-binkā mē’ah<sup>a</sup>ray* (Deut 7,4)

More importantly, the peoples listed in Deut 7,1 are indigenous to the land while those providing women for Solomon are not. The

only people common to both are Hittites, who could presumably be taken to be either indigenous or foreign. Correspondingly, the cults in question in 1 Kgs 11 are those of foreign deities. Four are mentioned by name though, somewhat surprisingly, two of the four (Milchom and Molech, perhaps variants) are Ammonite.

Much closer to the list of supplier nations in 1 Kgs 11 is the law in Deut 23,2-9 which disqualifies certain categories of people from membership in the *qāhāl*: Ammonites and Moabites in perpetuity, first and second generation Edomites and Egyptians<sup>(1)</sup>. These constitute the first four of the six (seven in LXX) supplier nations in 1 Kgs 11,1, which suggests that the standard list of (usually seven) *indigenous* nations — as in Deut 7,1 — has been modified rather drastically to bring it into line with the *qāhāl* law of Deut 23,2-9. The apparent citation of a law in 1 Kgs 11,2 is therefore a paraphrase rather than a direct quotation, one which is meant to recall (1) the general prohibition of intermarriage in Deut 7,1-4; (2) the law forbidding the king to accumulate women in Deut 17,17 which also speaks of the “turning away” of the heart (*yasūr lebā-bō*); and especially (3) the disqualification law in Deut 23,2-9<sup>(2)</sup>.

The only other allusion to Solomon's *nāšim nokriyyôt* — there is none in Chronicles — occurs towards the end of the Nehemiah memoir where he reports a rather brisk encounter with Jews who had married Ashdodite, Ammonite and Moabite women (Neh 13,23-27)<sup>(3)</sup>. The outcome was that Nehemiah imposed an oath on

(<sup>1</sup>) A very early date for this law was proposed by K. GALLING, “Das Gemeindegesetz in Deuteronomium 23”, *Festschrift A. Bertholet zum 80. Geburtstag* (ed. W. BAUMGARTNER *et al.*) (Tübingen 1950) 176-191. This, however, is only one of several possibilities.

(<sup>2</sup>) The awkward syntax of 1 Kgs 11,1 suggests that the list of five nations, including three of the four excluded from the *qāhāl* in Deut 23, is a later insertion. M. FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford 1985) 125-126, is therefore probably correct in postulating a post-exilic reformulation of the list of pre-Israelite nations in Deut 7,1 and elsewhere. On the different variations of the list see T. ISHIDA, “The Structure and Historical Implications of the Lists of Pre-Israelite Nations”, *Bib* 60 (1979) 461-490.

(<sup>3</sup>) Here, too, it seems, the reference to Ammonite and Moabite women is a later insertion. There is no conjunction before *'ammōniyyôt*, the following verse (13,24) speaks only of Ashdod, and the final phrase *w\*kišōn 'am wā'am* has been added, somewhat awkwardly, to accommodate the insertion. See my *Ezra-Nehemiah. A Commentary* (Old Testament Library; Philadelphia 1988) 361-362.

these men to forswear marriage with foreign women, the prohibition to apply both to themselves and their children. Since they had already contracted such marriages, we would be led to believe that they were obliged to divorce their wives, but this we are not told. The wording of the oath follows fairly closely that of the law in Deut 7,3:

*'im-tittēnū b'notēkem libnēhem w'e'im-tis'ū*  
*mibb'notēhem libnēkem w'elākem* (Neh 13,25b)  
*bitrēkā lo'-tittēn libnō ūbittō lo'-tiqqah libnekā* (Deut 7,3).

The main difference is, of course, the oath formula in the Nehemiah text. It is also in the plural, and the prohibition applies to themselves and their sons, as in Ezra 9,2 (see below). But Nehemiah goes on to supply a more specific illustration of the consequences of such marriages by citing the example of Solomon (13,26). The implication is that such marriages could lead not just to the introduction of foreign cults but also to a weakening or loss of national and ethnic identity, indicated by the inability of the children to speak their mother tongue.

Marriage with foreign women was also an important issue for Ezra, the designation *nāšim nokriyyôt* occurring seven times in the account of his attempt to solve the problem of exogamous marriage (Ezra 10,2.10-11.14.17-18.44). This account, probably a conflation of two versions<sup>(4)</sup>, opens with a report delivered by the *šārīm* to the effect that the people, laity and clergy, had contracted marriages with "the peoples of the lands" (*'ammē hā'arāšôt*). The wording, taken from the blanket prohibition in Deut 7,1-4, is similar to the oath formula in Neh 13,25b: "they have taken some of their womenfolk (literally, "daughters") for themselves and their sons". A catalogue of the nations in question then follows. The first four of the eight listed correspond to indigenous peoples in the standard list in Deut 7,1 and elsewhere<sup>(5)</sup>, but the last four are those excluded from the *qāhāl* in Deut 23,2-9<sup>(6)</sup>; the same, therefore, as in 1 Kgs

<sup>(4)</sup> See my *Ezra-Nehemiah*, 187.

<sup>(5)</sup> Gen 15,19-20; Exod 3,8.17; 33,2; 34,11; Deut 20,17; Judg 3,5.

<sup>(6)</sup> Reading "Edomites" for "Ammonites" with 1 Esd 8,69. In the standard catalogue (e.g. Deut 7,1) Amorites are never listed lower than third.

11,1. This suggests that the plural form *'ammē hā'arāšôt* (Ezra 9,1-2.11) was chosen deliberately to include elements both inside and outside of the province of Judah, and that therefore the *nāšīm nokriyyôt* to whom Ezra took such exception were outsiders with respect to the *gōlāh*-community which formed the dominant elite in the province.

This last point calls for further elaboration. In the account of the marriage crisis in Ezra 9-10 attention is focussed throughout on exogamous marriage as a problem for this social entity. The transgression of the law takes place among its members (9,4; 10,6), the assembly convoked to resolve the problem consists of the *be<sup>nē</sup> haggōlāh* in plenary session (10,7), non-attendance carries the penalty of expulsion with forfeiture of property (10,8), and the measures decided on were carried out by its members (10,16). By the time of Nehemiah, however, it seems that the integration of the province had proceeded to the point where the chief danger was perceived to come from outside Judah. Hence Nehemiah's action against a member of the high priestly family who had married into the Sanballats of Samaria (Neh 13,28-29; cf. the similar story in Josephus: *Ant* 11,302-12).

In pushing through his marriage reform Ezra had the support of certain "quakers" (*h<sup>a</sup>rēdīm*) who were especially devoted to the law and following whose advice the reform measures were implemented (Ezra 9,4; 10,3)(<sup>7</sup>). We are told that these measures were to be carried out "according to the law" (10,3), but we know of no law mandating separation or divorce from foreign women. What is therefore implied is a rigorist interpretation of the law in Deut 7,1-4, a passage which is referred to in the penitential prayer of Ezra in the same narrative context (9,10-12). If this strict ruling was typical of legal interpretation within Ezra's support group, we would have to add that it was by no means universally accepted either at that time or later in the Second Commonwealth period. It will be sufficient to recall the assurance of good standing extended to the foreigner (*ben-hannēkār*) in Isa 56,1-8, the case of Ruth the Moabite woman, and the conversion to Judaism of Achior the Ammonite in Jdt 14,10.

(<sup>7</sup>) The same term is still in use for the ultra-orthodox faction in Israel today.



## II. Proverbs 1-9 and Prophetic Texts from the Persian Period

These connections create a *prima facie* case for interpreting the warnings against the Outsider Woman in Prov 1-9 in light of the social situation, and the social issue of exogamy in particular, in the province of Judah during the two centuries of Iranian rule. The case is strengthened by some interesting linguistic and thematic parallels between these chapters and prophetic texts dated to this period<sup>(8)</sup>. It is generally agreed that where the Woman Wisdom speaks (Prov 1,20-33; 8,1-21), she does so in the guise of a prophetic figure, and her admonitions incorporate prophetic forms of discourse<sup>(9)</sup>. Similarity with prophecy from the Persian period is most clearly seen in the invitation-response pattern in the first discourse in which Wisdom's offer falls on deaf ears:

Because I call and you refused (to listen),  
Stretched out my hand, and no one heeded... (1,24)

or

Then they will call on me and I will not answer,  
They will seek me out but will not find me. (1,28)

with which we may compare:

Then you shall call and YHWH will answer;  
You shall cry out, and he will say, Here I am. (Isa 58,9)

I was ready to be sought by those who did not ask for me;  
I was ready to be found by those who did not seek me.  
I said, Here I am, here I am,  
To a nation that did not call on my name.  
I spread out my hands all the day to a rebellious people. (Isa 65,1-2a)

I called and no one answered,  
I spoke, and they did not listen;  
They did what was evil in my sight,  
Choosing what I did not delight in. (Isa 66,4)

A variation on the same pattern occurs in the invitation extended by *hokmôt* to the immature youths to participate in a banquet (9,1-6), reminiscent of the invitation to eat and drink gratis in Isa 55,1-2.

<sup>(8)</sup> Many of these are assembled by A. ROBERT, "Les attaches littéraires bibliques de Prov I-IX", *RB* 43 (1934) 42-68, 172-204, 374-384; 44 (1935) 344-365, 502-525.

<sup>(9)</sup> See, for example, R. N. WHYBRAY, *Wisdom in Proverbs* (Naperville, IL 1965) 77. W. MCKANE, *Proverbs. A New Approach* (Philadelphia 1970) 273, 276, prefers the analogy of a wise teacher endowed with divine authority.

Even closer is the contrasting picture of the spread table and mixed wine in honor of the deities Gad and Meni in Isa 65,11, possibly a cultic meal of the *marzeah* type<sup>(10)</sup>.

Similar echoes are heard in the sage's description of the reprobates (Prov 1,10-19) with its emphasis on violence and oppression, a recurring motif in prophecy of the Persian period (e.g. Isa 58,3-4; 59,1-15). The social and economic inequalities in Judean society at that time, including profiteering (*beša'*, Prov 1,19; Isa 56,11b), were to call for drastic action during Nehemiah's tenure of office (see especially Neh 5). The statement that the feet of the reprobates run to commit evil, and they hasten to shed blood (Prov 1,16) reproduces verbatim an indictment in Isa 59,7a. Here, too, the author of Prov 1-9 appears to be drawing on prophetic discourse from that time. The same connection can be seen where the author speaks of the *zārāh* abandoning the companion of her youth (*'allûp nē'ûrēhā*) and forgetting the covenant of her god (Prov 2,17). This way of putting it calls to mind Malachi's indictment of the Judean who had "married the daughter of a foreign god", in the process abandoning the wife of his youth (*'ēšet nē'ûrekā*) who is his covenanted wife (*'ēšet berîtekā*, Mal 2,11.14-15; cf. Isa 54,6, *'ēšet nē'ûrîm*). Other *attaches littéraires* will be noted in due course.

### III. The Identity of the "Outsider Woman"

We now need to take a closer look at the identity of this "outsider woman" in Prov 1-9. The terms used are *'iššāh zārāh* (2,16; 7,5) or simply *zārāh* (5,3.20); alternatively, *nokriyyāh* (2,16; 5,20; 6,24; 7,5). These are negative designations, defining the person in question out of a certain normative group or category<sup>(11)</sup>. Her social status is therefore determined with reference to a particular social configuration to which a normative character is assigned. The most obvious allusion would be to a married woman in search of sexual adventure outside of marriage or, as McKane puts it, "any

<sup>(10)</sup> On the *marzeah* association see B. PORTEN, *Archives from Elephantine* (Berkeley-Los Angeles 1968) 179-186 with bibliography.

<sup>(11)</sup> On these terms see P. HUMBERT, "Les adjectifs 'zar' et 'nokri' et la femme étrangère", *Mélanges Syriens offerts à M. René Dussaud* I (Paris 1939) 259-266; L. A. SNIJDERS, "The Meaning of *zar* in the Old Testament", *OTS* 10 (1954) 103-104; also *TDOT* IV, 56-57.

woman outside of the conventions" (12). But this can hardly exhaust the significance of the *zārāh* in these chapters, or suffice to explain the recurrence of the two designations wherever her presence and activity are described. In the moralising didactic literature of ancient Egypt, the influence of which on Israelite and early Jewish wisdom is incontestable, the *femme fatale* is typically a foreigner or at least an outsider with respect to the society in which the recipient of the advice moves (e.g. the Instruction of Ani, ANET 420). As for Israel, Solomon's marriages constitute only one of several examples of the unfortunate consequences of union with outsiders. The ancestor Judah, we recall, had nothing but trouble as a result of his marriage to a Canaanite woman (Gen 38), thus leaving behind a cautionary example parallel to that of Solomon for his descendants. (In 1 Chr 2,3 the woman in question bears the name Bathshua, perhaps not by coincidence identical with the name given by the same author to Bathsheba, wife first of the Hittite Uriah, then of David, 1 Chr 3,5.) Then there were the Hittite wives of Esau, a source of general vexation according to the P version of the Jacob story (Gen 26,34-35; 27,46-28,1). The parade example is, of course, the Peor incident in which the Israelite Zimri was summarily despatched for marrying a Midianite woman (Num 25). That it was a case of marriage rather than a casual liaison with a prostitute, cultic or otherwise, is clear from the careful way in which the incident is described: he brought her to his kinsmen (*'ahîm*) in the presence of Moses and the plenary Israelite assembly (*kol- 'adat benē yiśrā'ēl*, Num 25,6). Often rehearsed as the "original sin" of these early settlers (13), the incident would have taken on new relevance with the return from the Babylonian diaspora and encounter with the diverse ethnic groups in and around the homeland (14).

There still remains the task of explaining the vivid, not to say lurid, characterization of this woman and her activities. There is

(12) MCKANE, *Proverbs*, 286. That the woman in question is married is either stated explicitly (2,16-19; 6,26; 7,19-20) or implied by the context (5,1-23; 6,24-35; 7,4-5). The only possible exception would be in the portrayal of the "foolish woman" as a prostitute (9,13-18).

(13) Num 31,16; Josh 22,17; 23,12; Judg 3,5-6; Hos 9,10; Ps 106,28-31.

(14) We may therefore read Ezra 9-10 as contributing to a typological correspondence between the first exodus and occupation of the land and the events following on the decree of Cyrus, a new and more benign Pharaoh. See my *Ezra-Nehemiah*, 36-37.

some precedent for this kind of descriptive prose in those prophetic passages, not among the most attractive for the modern reader, in which perceived feminine characteristics are the object of vituperation, but the similarities are not particularly striking. Several commentators have therefore plausibly suggested some degree of influence from a goddess cult, probably of the Canaanite or Phoenician variety<sup>(15)</sup>. The hypothesis need not be pursued in detail at this point. Suffice it to note the woman's chosen pitch on the high places of the city (7,12; 9,14), allusions to her house and bed (2,18; 5,8; 7,16-17.27; 9,14), and her association with death and the shades of the dead (2,18; 9,18). Goddess cults in pre-exilic Israel are well attested and seem to have been of special interest to women. The worship of Asherah was promoted by Maacah the queen-mother during the reign of Asa (1 Kgs 15,13), by Jezebel wife of Ahab (1 Kgs 18,19), and presumably also by her daughter Athaliah during her brief reign in Judah (2 Kgs 8,18; 11,1-20). Inscriptions from the ninth or eighth century BC discovered at Kuntillet 'Ajrūd and Khirbet el-Qôm testify to a close association between the cult of Yahweh and that of Asherah, even if the much discussed *'šrth* which appears in both is taken to refer to a cult symbol rather than directly to the goddess herself, a conclusion which is far from assured<sup>(16)</sup>. Proscribed by the reform party under Josiah (2 Kgs 23,4-7), the cult of this goddess persisted nevertheless after the deportations (Ezek 8, 3.5) as a focus of special devotion for women (Jer 44,15-19), and still had its devotees during the two centuries of Persian rule.

Of particular interest is the strange vision of the woman in the ephah reported by Zechariah (5,5-11) at the beginning of this period. The woman (or, more likely, a feminine figurine) who must be removed from Judah and transported to Babylon is certainly a goddess and, to judge by the name given her, none other than the goddess Asherah<sup>(17)</sup>. It would therefore not be surprising if the description of the *zārāh/nokriyyāh* in Proverbs 1-9 was influenced

<sup>(15)</sup> Especially G. BOSTRÖM, *Proverbiastudien: die Weisheit und das fremde Weib in Spr. 1-9* (Lund 1935). The literature of the last half-century is surveyed in the first chapter of Claudia CAMP's *Wisdom and the Feminine in the Book of Proverbs* (Sheffield 1985).

<sup>(16)</sup> Bibliographical references can be found in M.S. SMITH, "God Male and Female in the Old Testament", *TS* 48 (1987) 333-340.

<sup>(17)</sup> She is designated by the unusual feminine form *hārišāh* (= wickedness), suggesting Asherah by assonance.

by language and themes associated with the goddess cult familiar to the author's contemporaries.

From the same period come the denunciations of alien cults and their devotees in the last section of Isaiah (Isa 57,3-13; 65,1-7.11-12; 66,3-4.17). The first of these (Isa 57,3-13) is of particular interest for our theme. It is addressed first to the children of a woman who is a sorceress, adulteress and harlot (vv. 3-5), then to the woman herself (vv. 6-13). The situation is therefore somewhat reminiscent of Hosea's "woman of harlotry" and "children of harlotry" (*'ēšet zēnūnīm*, *yaldē zēnūnīm*, Hos 1,2). Not everything said about this woman in Isaiah 57 is clear, but the principal gravamen is participation in idolatrous rites of a sexual nature together with child sacrifice and necromancy. In several respects the description of this sorceress (*'onēnāh*) runs parallel with that of the *zārāh* in Proverbs 1-9. Both are adulteresses and prostitutes, wanton and shameless, whose pitch is on the high places (Isa 57,7; Prov 9,14), who have their own houses in which the most important piece of furniture is the bed<sup>(18)</sup>, and who engage in sacrificial cults (Isa 57,6-7; Prov 7,14). Association with the realm of the dead is also suggested for both the *'onēnāh* and the *zārāh*, and the cultic undertones in both cases are clearly audible. The comparison may therefore help to contextualise the negative female imagery in Proverbs 1-9 and at the same time confirm the social setting which has been suggested.

The negative characterization of the *zārāh* is highlighted by contrast with the description of *ḥokmāh* (*ḥokmôt* in Prov 1,20; 9,1), a woman of a very different kind. The endowing of *ḥokmāh* with personal traits is a natural development from the way in which the teacher, the "Solomon" of the title, speaks of his instruction as desirable, to be embraced, etc (e.g. Prov 3,18; 4,13). She is also "more precious than pearls" (3,15; 8,11), an expression which appears to have been proverbial for the good wife (cf. Prov 31,10; Job 28,18). The mere fact of personification is not in itself remarkable; it is one example of the figurative language which the

(18) Isa 57,8. The sign (*zikkārôn*) put up by the woman at the doorpost was probably of an explicitly sexual nature; cf. the *šalmē zākār* (male images — of the phallus?) of Ezek 16,17. It served to identify the place as a "house of ill fame". For the house and bed of the *nokkriyāh* see Prov 2,18; 5,8; 7,16-17.27; 9,14.

prologue leads us to expect (1,6), and wisdom is not the only abstract quality personified in these chapters (*bînāh*, understanding, in 7,4). What rather deserves note is the deliberate strategy of juxtaposing the Woman Wisdom and the Outsider Woman as rivals for attention. Both seek to influence their audience — the younger male population, married or unmarried — principally but of course not exclusively by seductive speech<sup>(19)</sup>. They both therefore go out into the public arena — the streets, suqs, acropolis, the open plaza by the city gate — where the male population is likely to be found (1,20-21; 8,1-3; cf. 7,10-12; 9,13-15). Both also have houses in which they prepare entertainment for their guests of a sharply contrasting nature (9,1-6; cf. 2,18; 5,8; 7,27; 9,13-16). The one is a faithful wife, the other variously described as an adulteress and a prostitute (3,13-15; 7,4; 8,11; cf. 2,17; 6,26; 7,10.19-20). Both can be grasped and embraced (3,18; 4,8; cf. 5,20), but while contact with one is life-enhancing, the other is death-dealing, a *femme fatale* in the literal sense (3,16.18.22; 8,35; cf. 2,19; 5,5-6; 7,23.27; 9,18). They both use much the same metaphorical language — water from your own well, stolen water — but the effect in the one case is salvific, in the other corrupting.

This being the situation, it is much more likely that the figure of the Woman Wisdom was conceived as a counter to the Outsider Woman than the contrary. There is the obvious fact that wisdom, as the personification of the sage's teaching, is meant to counter aberrant moral and religious conduct. Furthermore, the association between the allure of alien deities (*'elohim zārîm*) and sexual seduction was well-established by the time of writing, while efforts to identify an Israelite or Canaanite deity that could have served as a model for the Woman Wisdom have not been successful<sup>(20)</sup>. The Woman Wisdom is therefore in all essential respects a reverse mirror image of the Outsider Woman. The process by which the contrast was set up may be detected in Prov 7,4-5 where the student is invited to call *hokmāh* his sister (i.e. spouse) and *bînāh* (insight) his intimate

<sup>(19)</sup> J.N. ALETTI, "Seduction et Parole en Proverbes I-IX", *VT* 27 (1977) 129-144; G.A. YEE, "'I have perfumed my bed with myrrh': the Foreign Woman (*iššā zārā*) in Proverbs 1-9", *JSOT* 43 (1989) 53-68.

<sup>(20)</sup> W.E. ALBRIGHT, "The Goddess of Life and Wisdom", *AJSL* 36 (1919/1920) 258-294 and, more recently, R.J. CLIFFORD, "Proverbs IX: A Suggested Ugaritic Parallel", *VT* 25 (1975) 298-306; B. LANG, *Wisdom and the Book of Proverbs: An Israelite Goddess Redefined* (New York 1986).

acquaintance or "significant other", and to do this in order to preserve himself from the Outsider Woman. But the clearest indication is the invitation of Wisdom (now *ḥokmôt*) to a banquet in her seven-columned house (9,1-6), an invitation which has been closely modelled on that of the lascivious woman which follows (9,13-18; vv. 7-12 are generally thought to have been inserted later). It has been pointed out that the young women sent out by Wisdom to issue the invitation are a pale reflection of the devotees of the goddess of love, except that, as McKane puts it, "they invite young men not to bed but to school" <sup>(21)</sup>. A small but significant pointer in the same direction is that the wording of the invitation ("whoever is simple let him turn in here"), identical for both, fits the invitation of the *'ēšet k'esilût* who is sitting on the doorstep of her house (9,14a) better than that of *ḥokmôt*. The personification of wisdom is therefore, I suggest, a secondary elaboration, a counter to the Outsider Woman, in the context of the exogamy-endogamy issue in the early Second Temple period.

#### IV. The Social and Economic Consequences of Exogamy

The socioeconomic implications of succumbing to the wiles of the *zārāh* are stated at some length in Prov 5,7-14. The sage begins with yet another admonition to stay away from her:

Keep your way far from her,  
Do not approach the entrance to her house <sup>(22)</sup>.

<sup>(21)</sup> MCKANE, *Proverbs*, 360.

<sup>(22)</sup> One might speculate on the presence of a double entendre in this couplet, the overt sense concealing an exhortation to avoid sexual intercourse with the woman. This would be fairly transparent where the sage speaks of the entrance of her house, especially in view of the house-body symbolic equivalence in psychoanalytic theory. In addition, Ugaritic *drkt* (power, dominion) has suggested a similar connotation in several biblical occurrences of *derek* — e.g. M. DAHOOD, "Ugaritic DRKT and Biblical DEREK", *TS* 15 (1954) 627-631 — and in one or two of these instances the context favors the sense of sexual power, i.e., potency (Jer 3,13 cf. v.6; Prov 31,3). The conclusion of the numerical proverb in Prov 30,18-19 (*derek geber be'almāh*) may also encode this other meaning. Whether the same connotation is present in Amos 8,14 (*w'ēy derek be'ēr-šeba'*), where the allusion is certainly to a deity, cannot be determined, but one is reminded of the female deity Derketo or Darkatu worshipped in Roman Ascalon. H. ZIRCHER, "drk = potentia?", *BZ NF* 2 (1958) 291-294, questioned the meaning "power" assigned to Ugaritic *drkt* and was prepared to admit only the possibility of a euphemistic use of biblical *drk* as "sexuelle Kraft".

He then predicts that failure to comply with this advice will result in surrendering your honor or status (*hōd*) to others, your strength or wealth (*koah*) to outsiders (*zārīm*), and (the fruits of) your labors to a foreign household (*bēt nokrî*)<sup>(23)</sup>. The net result is that the young man addressed ends up in all kinds of trouble in the *qāhāl* and *ʿēdāh*. This could be a recital, somewhat exaggerated in keeping with the genre, of the sad effects of sexual indiscretion in general, but the severity of the outcome — endangering or loss of status in the political and religious community — justifies a broader interpretation. We recall that non-attendance at the plenary session of the *qēhal haggōlāh* convoked by Ezra to solve the problem of intermarriage carried the penalty of expulsion from that body (Ezra 10,8), and it would be safe to assume that the penalty for marriage outside the diaspora collectivity would be no less. Those who failed to attend were also threatened with confiscation of all their property. The term *reḳūš* used here generally connotes movable property, and livestock in particular<sup>(24)</sup>, though occasionally it has a broader and more general meaning that might be taken to include real estate<sup>(25)</sup>. In any case, it is difficult to see how any individual expelled from this social group could maintain property rights over his inherited land holdings. We learn from Ezek 11,14-15 that those left behind after the first deportation claimed possession of the land, and therefore title to the real estate vacated by the deportees, by representing the deportation as expulsion from the Jerusalem cult community. They are thereby devising a theological explanation of the redistribution of land by the Babylonians after the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple (Jer 39,10; 2 Kgs 25,12 = Jer 52,16). The implication would seem to be that social status and title to land, the hereditary *naḥālāh* or *ʿahuzzāh*, were contingent on good standing in the Judean temple community. And it may be worth noting in that respect that, according to the sage's teaching in Proverbs 1-9, one of the advantages of resisting the wiles of the *zārāh* is permanence in the land, while the penalty for succumbing is being "cut off" from it (*yikkārētū*, Prov 2,21-22; cf. Isa 57,13; 60,21; 65,9)<sup>(26)</sup>.

<sup>(23)</sup> Cf. Hos 7,9: *ʾakēlū zārīm koḥō*, "foreigners have consumed his strength (or wealth)".

<sup>(24)</sup> Gen 12,5; 13,6; 14,11-12.16.21; 31,18; 36,7; 46,6; Num 16,32; 35,3; Ezra 1,6.

<sup>(25)</sup> 1 Chr 27,31; 2 Chr 21,14; 31,3; 32,29; 35,7.

<sup>(26)</sup> Cf. the excommunication formula (*nikrētāh hannepeš hahî*...) in



A further point to be made is that the confiscation of property threatened in Ezra 10,8 is expressed by means of the verb *ḥrm*, suggesting that the property in question devolved on the temple and its personnel (cf. use of the same verb in Lev 27,28-29; Josh 6,18-19; Mic 4,13). Lev 27,16-29 contains a prescription dealing with the dedication to Yahweh, i.e., to the temple, of land and its produce. It mandates assessment of the value of the property by a priest and states the price — the assessed value plus 20% — at which it could be redeemed if the donor had second thoughts. It also states the circumstances under which a parcel of land became a *šēdēh haḥērem*, a dedicated plot, and thus the inalienable property of the priesthood. Assuming that this is not purely theoretical, and that it corresponds to actual practice at the time of the Second Temple, it may be taken to indicate that the temple personnel drew part of their revenue from real estate, as we know was the case elsewhere in the Achaemenid empire.

There is, of course, no question that marriage with a partner outside of the Judean temple community, whether living outside the province or within its borders (cf. Prov 5,17), could have serious religious implications. This is quite explicit in Ezra-Nehemiah, as we have seen, but is also reflected indirectly in Pentateuchal law and illustrative narrative. There is, for example, the case history of the blasphemer, son of an Egyptian father and Israelite mother (Lev 24,10-23 P), and a somewhat analogous instance is that of the marriage of a priest's daughter to a *zār*, in the circumstances probably an outsider with respect to the priesthood or, in other words, a layman<sup>(27)</sup>. But religious infidelity could also have a significant economic impact, including loss of revenue sustained by the mandatory Yahweh-cult, economic support of which is inculcated by the sage in Prov 3,9-10. The same consequence is illustrated by the *zār* marriage

---

the P legislation (e.g. Gen 17,14; Exod 12,15; 31,14; Lev 7,20; 17,4; Num 9,13; 15,30-31). The terminology is studied by W. HORBURY, "Extirpation and Excommunication", *VT* 35 (1985) 13-38.

(27) For this meaning of *zār* see Exod 29,33; 30,33; Lev 22,10.13; Num 3,10; 17,5; 18,4.7. The spectacular suppression of the rebellion of the Levite Korah supported by 250 lay leaders (Num 16,1-17,15) illustrates the importance the priesthood attached to exclusive control of the temple including, of course, its considerable revenues. The lesson, spelled out clearly for all to read, is that no *'iś zār*, i.e., non-Aaronite, has access to priestly prerogatives (Num 17,5).

of a priest's daughter. Such a marriage excluded her from a share in the "holy things", i.e., the perquisites of the priesthood and priestly families, unless she was widowed or divorced and childless (Lev 22,12-13). The purpose of the law was to prevent access to both priestly status and the economic perquisites that went with it on the part of non-priestly families. While this is obviously a special case, it illustrates the grave social and economic consequences inherent in matchmaking, and the care with which matters concerning marriage and inheritance were regulated in the post-exilic Judean community.

The concern to avoid the undesirable social and economic consequences of *zār* marriage, i.e., marriage outside of a particular defining social entity, is reflected in several other stipulations of law. Such consequences would more readily ensue when the wife survived the husband, which we may assume happened as often then as it does now. The most obvious example is the levirate law (Deut 25,5-10). To prevent the alienation of family property, this law stipulates that the childless widow (the *yēbāmāh*) must not marry an *ʾiš zār*, i.e., one outside of the family unit. The levirate law served to mitigate somewhat the situation in Israel according to which, exceptionally in the context of ancient Near Eastern law, the widow did not inherit the property of her deceased husband<sup>(28)</sup>. On the other hand, the surviving daughter of a property holder who died without a male heir could inherit in preference to a brother, uncle or other male relative of the deceased (Num 27,1-11; cf. Josh 17,3-6), but to this provision of law was added a codicil forbidding the female heir to marry outside of her tribe (Num 36,1-12), *a fortiori* outside of the Israelite community. Here, too, the intent of the law was to prevent economic loss to the phratry in the form of its hereditary land holding (Num 27,7)<sup>(29)</sup>.

These and similar legal issues concerning marriage and inheritance assumed prime importance with the resettlement of Babylonian immigrants during the first century of Persian rule and the inevitable conflicts over title to property which ensued. One

<sup>(28)</sup> E. W. DAVIES, "Inheritance Rights and the Hebrew Levirate Marriage", *VT* 31 (1981) 138-144, 257-268.

<sup>(29)</sup> In addition to the commentaries see Z. VALK, "The Rights of Inheritance of a Daughter in Bible and Talmud", *Tarbiz* 23 (1951/1952) 9-15; J. WEINGREEN, "The Case of the Daughters of Zelophahad", *VT* 16 (1966) 518-522.

aspect of this situation is reflected in a short homily or disputation in Mal 2,10-16, probably from around the middle of the fifth century BC. After accusing his fellow-Judeans in general terms of mutual betrayal by violating the ancestral covenant, the author indicts them on the specific charge of marriage with "the daughter of a foreign god" which implied profanation of the sanctuary (11b). Much about this passage remains obscure, but the expression "daughter of a foreign god" (*bat-'ēl nēkār*) most probably refers simply to a foreign woman, devotee of an alien deity, and therefore outside of the circle of those claiming descent from the same ancestor and owing allegiance to the one god who created them (10a)<sup>(30)</sup>. The penalty exacted for contracting such marriages is expulsion from this social entity ("the tents of Jacob") and exclusion from participation in the cult (11b-12). In the second part of the disputation (13-16) it becomes apparent that exogamous marriage also involved divorcing one's original wife — variously described as "the wife of your youth" (*'ēšet nē'ūrēkā*, 14a.15b) and "your companion and covenanted wife" (*ḥabertekā we'ēšet beritekā*, 14b). The most plausible fifth-century setting for this indictment would be the situation of those Babylonian *olim* who, on their return to the homeland, abandoned the wives they brought with them for native women, and one important motive for doing so may well have been the acquisition or reacquisition of property deeded to these women.

That the denunciations in Proverbs 1-9 of those who succumb to the wiles of the *zārāh* envisage the same situation is suggested by the similar terminology used in referring to the original wife (Prov 2,17; 5,18) and the similar outcome predicted (*ūrešā'im mē'ēreš*

<sup>(30)</sup> The alternative view, that the term refers to a goddess, and the action denounced to adopting her cult, was proposed by C.C. TORREY, "The Prophecy of Malachi", *JBL* 17 (1898) 4-5, 9-10 and taken up by several more recent commentators including F.F. HVIDBERG, *Weeping and Laughter in the Old Testament* (Leiden 1962) 120-123; A. ISAAKSSON, *Marriage and Ministry in the New Testament* (Lund 1965) 31-32; G.W. AHLSTRÖM, *Joel and the Temple Cult of Jerusalem* (Leiden 1971) 49-50. The arguments pro and con are reviewed by R.L. SMITH, *Micah-Malachi* (Word Bible Commentary; Waco, Texas 1984) 321-325 and B. GLAZIER-MCDONALD, *Malachi, The Divine Messenger* (Atlanta 1987) 91-93 and "Intermarriage, Divorce and the *Bat-'ēl Nēkār*: Insights into Mal 2:10-16", *JBL* 106 (1987) 603-611.

*yikkārētū*, Prov 2,22 cf. *yakrēt YHWH lā'îš 'ašer ya<sup>a</sup>šennāh*, Mal 2,12). The wicked (*rešā'im*) are also identified as *bogedim*, a verbal form occurring five times in Mal 2,10-16 with reference to marital infidelity (cf. Exod 21,8; Jer 3,20). The similarity would be even more striking if the obscure *ēr we'oneh* of Mal 2,12 could be taken to refer to the sexual attraction exercised by the woman who replaces the original wife. This, however, is only one of several possibilities<sup>(31)</sup>.

## V. Conclusion

The upper-class origin and ethos of the wisdom literature in general, and Proverbs 1-9 in particular<sup>(32)</sup>, suggest that the warnings against the wiles of the Outsider Woman were addressed primarily to members of the socially superior lay and priestly families of Babylonian origin who formed the controlling elite in the province under Achaemenid rule. The initial report to Ezra states that community leaders were the first to contract marriages with women outside of the *gôlāh*-community (Ezra 9,2). Nothing much can be learned about the social status of the offenders listed in Ezra 10, but we hear elsewhere of intermarriage involving the dominant Sanballat family in Samaria and the Ammonite Tobiards (Neh 6,18-19; 13,28-29). The principal object of these *mariages de convenance* was doubtless the promotion of the political and economic interests of these great families. In opposing these interests, and promoting the autonomy of the province of Judah, Nehemiah seems to have enjoyed the support of the Persian imperial administration in spite of attempts to discredit him. An important aspect of Achaemenid policy was the identification, support and maintenance of dominant elites in the provinces on the support of which the central government felt it could rely. One such elite was the collectivity known in our sources as the *b'nē haggôlāh* (Ezra 4,1; 6,19; 10,7.16) which enjoyed imperial support in the rebuilding of the temple and the control of its operations and resources, which translated very readily into a large measure of social control.

It may be worth adding that Persian social custom favored endogamy, including marriage with close relatives, in order to

<sup>(31)</sup> Argued by GLAZIER-MCDONALD, *Malachi, The Divine Messenger*, 94-99.

<sup>(32)</sup> See R. GORDIS, "The Social Background of Wisdom Literature", *HUCA* 18 (1943/1944) 77-118.

preserve intact the material patrimony of the family or phratry<sup>(33)</sup>. Insistence on endogamy, with a view to preserving the integrity of the dominant elite, would therefore presumably have been looked on with official favor, though the same benevolence may not have been extended to Ezra's policy of mandatory divorce of foreign wives.

The thesis advanced here, that the diatribe against the Outsider Woman in Proverbs 1-9 is to be read in the context of the social situation of the early post-exilic period, may incidentally mediate between the opposing meanings assigned in the commentary on these chapters to the terms *zārāh* and *nokriyyāh*. There are those, on the one hand, who take them to refer simply to a foreign woman, while others find in them an allusion to an Israelite woman who is either an adulteress or one who is in some way on the margins of society. What perhaps was lacking on both sides of the debate was an appreciation of the complex realities of Judean society during the two centuries of Iranian rule, and especially the presence within it of a socially and economically dominant elite. The anxiety of this elite to preserve its social status and economic assets may therefore have been an important factor in generating the language in which the Outsider Woman is described and her activities denounced.

Department of Theology  
University of Notre Dame  
Notre Dame, IN 46556 USA

Joseph BLENKINSOPP

## SOMMAIRE

La description de la personne et des activités de la *'iššā zarā/nokriyyā* en Prov 1-9 doit être lue dans le contexte de la situation sociale de la province de Juda à l'époque perse et plus précisément à la lumière de la tentative faite par l'élite dominante d'origine babylonienne (*gōlā* ou *bēnē haggōlā*) pour éliminer les mariages exogamiques. Les mesures prises à cette fin se fondent sur une interprétation stricte de Dt 7,1-4 et 23,2-9 et montent en épingle le mauvais exemple de Salomon, l'auteur supposé de Prov 1-9. L'article en conclut que le souci de la *gōlā* de préserver son statut social et économique a influencé de façon significative la description de la « femme étrangère » de Prov 1-9.

<sup>(33)</sup> See M. SCHWARTZ in I. GERSHEVITCH (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Iran*. Vol. 2: *The Median and Achaemenian Periods* (Cambridge 1985) 655-656; C. HERRENSCHMIDT, "Notes sur la Parenté chez les Perses au Debut de l'Empire Achéménide", *Achaemenid History II: The Greek Sources* (ed. H. SANCISI-WEERDENBURG - A. KUERT) (Leiden 1987) 53-67.

## **Jer 25 und die Fremdvölkersprüche: Unterschiede zwischen hebräischem und griechischem Text**

Die Unterschiede zwischen dem hebräischen (MT) und griechischen (G) Text von Jeremia sind schon früh bemerkt worden<sup>(1)</sup>. Einer der markantesten Unterschiede zwischen beiden Texten liegt in den Fremdvölkersprüchen, die bei G in Jer 25–31, bei MT in Jer 46–51 zu finden sind. Neben dieser unterschiedlichen Stellung differiert auch die Reihenfolge der Völker. Nach den Untersuchungen führender Fachleute<sup>(2)</sup> gilt die Ordnung von G heute als die ursprüngliche. Doch gibt es einige Anzeichen, die in die andere Richtung deuten und so erneut die Frage aufwerfen: Welche Anordnung der Fremdvölkersprüche ist die ursprüngliche?

Wir wollen dieser Frage in vier Schritten nachgehen. Zuerst setzen wir uns mit den Argumenten für die Priorität von G auseinander. Dann untersuchen wir den Befund an der Stelle, wo die Versionen auseinandergehen (Jer 25). Darauf folgt ein Blick auf die größeren Verschiedenheiten bei den Fremdvölkersprüchen, insofern sie

<sup>(1)</sup> Origenes erwähnt in seinem Brief an Julius Africanus um ca. 250 "Umstellungen und Veränderungen des Textes der Prophezeiungen" bei Jeremia (*La lettre à Africanus sur l'histoire de Suzanne* [Hrsg. N. DE LANGE] [SC 302; Paris 1983] 530). — Um 414 verweist Hieronymus im Prolog zum Jeremiakommentar auf die "durch Irrtum verworrene Ordnung" und "vieles, was fehlt", das er "aus den hebräischen Quellen wiederherzustellen" sich vornimmt (*Sancti Hieronymi in Hieremiam* [Hrsg. S. REITER] [CChr SL 74; Turnholt 1960, 1]).

<sup>(2)</sup> J. G. JANZEN, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah* (HSM 6; Cambridge 1973) 115f; P.-M. BOGAERT, "De Baruch à Jérémie. Les deux rédactions conservées du livre de Jérémie", *Le Livre de Jérémie* (Hrsg. P.-M. BOGAERT) (BETL 54; Leuven 1981) 168–173; weiters vom selben Autor: "Le personnage de Baruch et l'histoire du livre de Jérémie, SE VII (Hrsg. E. A. LIVINGSTONE) (Berlin 1982) 73–81, und ebenso: "Relecture et déplacement de l'oracle contre les Philistins. Pour une datation de la rédaction longue (TM) du livre de Jérémie", *La Vie de la Parole* (FS P. Grelot; Paris 1987) 139–150; E. TOV, "Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah", *Le Livre de Jérémie* (Hrsg. P.-M. BOGAERT) (BETL 54; Leuven 1981) 145–167.

sich in Reihenfolge und Überschriften- bzw. Endungensystem zeigen, bevor wir zuletzt die Ergebnisse abzuwägen versuchen.

### I. Argumente für G-Priorität bei den Fremdvölkersprüchen

Die herausragenden Vertreter der G-Priorität<sup>(3)</sup> sind J. G. Janzen und P.-M. Bogaert. Sie gestehen G bei den Völkerworten nicht nur in bezug auf den Platz, sondern auch in bezug auf die Ordnung den Vorrang vor MT zu. Janzen hat durch seine unter F. M. Cross geschriebene Dissertation das Feld der Textforschung bei Jeremia neu belebt. In ihr glaubt er, in eine bestehende Sammlung im Umfang von Jer 1–45 seien die Völkerworte, analog zu den anderen großen Prophetenbüchern, bei denen auch die Sektion "Unheil gegen fremde Völker" in der Mitte steht, zuerst zwischen 25,13b und 25,15 eingefügt worden<sup>(4)</sup>. Ein Anlaß für die Einfügung dort sei das bereits in Jer 25 vorhandene Spruchmaterial gewesen. Das so entstehende neue Jeremiabuch hätte alte Manuskripte unbrauchbar gemacht, wenn man sich nicht damit beholfen hätte, die eigentlich in die Mitte gehörenden Völkerworte durch das Annähen eines Anhangs an das alte Manuskript als Nachtrag anzuschließen. In einem letzten Stadium sei Jer 52 als zweiter Anhang dazugekommen. — Die von Janzen soweit vorgetragenen Überlegungen sind leicht umkehrbar<sup>(5)</sup>: Wenn eine ursprüngliche Sammlung Jer 1–45 bestanden

<sup>(3)</sup> Nach A. SCHOLZ, *Der masorethische Text und die LXX-Übersetzung des Buches Jeremias* (Regensburg 1875) 3-4, ist G-Priorität zum ersten Mal von J. D. Michaelis im 18. Jht. in den Anmerkungen zur Übersetzung von Mt 27,9-10 vertreten worden. Über Scholz hinaus bietet JANZEN, *Studies*, 1-9, einen geschichtlichen Überblick über die wechselnde Bevorzugung zwischen MT und G. — Eigens herauszuheben ist, daß der neben Bogaert bekannteste Septuagintaforscher E. Tov das Verhältnis von MT und G nuanciert sieht. In dem in der vorigen Anmerkung zitierten Aufsatz sowie in: "L'incidence de la critique textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie", *RB* 79 (1972) 189-199, und in: "Exegetical Notes on the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX", *ZAW* 91 (1979) 73-93, rechnet er mit späteren Ausweitungen und Zusätzen gegenüber der hebräischen Vorlage von G in dem zu MT führenden hebräischen Text; auf der anderen Seite zeigt er in: "Did the Septuagint translators always understand their Hebrew text?", *De Septuaginta* (FS J. W. Wevers; [Hrsg. A. PIETERSMA-C. COX] Mississauga 1984) sehr deutlich die Schwierigkeiten für die griechischen Übersetzer und damit mögliche Fehlerquellen von G auf.

<sup>(4)</sup> JANZEN, *Studies*, 115-116.

<sup>(5)</sup> Diese Einsicht drückt auch BOGAERT, "Le personnage", 73, Anm. 2, in der Gegenrichtung aus.

hat, dann lag es doch näher und war mit weniger Aufwand verbunden, die Völkerworte zuerst an sie anzuhängen. Erst im Zuge einer Übersetzung, wie sie G darstellt, ist die Stellung vertauschbar, ohne daß alte Handschriften wertlos werden. Da kann, wie Janzen durch den Zusammenhang mit dem Spruchmaterial Jer 25 vermutet, G die Völkerworte vorgestellt haben. Doch ist festzuhalten, daß wir uns bei dieser Frage nach der Entstehung des Jeremiabuches bei unserem derzeitigen Wissensstand auf weitgehend hypothetischem Boden bewegen.

Janzen setzt sich dann auch dafür ein, daß G in der Ordnung der Fremdvölkersprüche Priorität zukomme. Die Sammlung dieser Sprüche sei eine sekundäre Zusammenstellung, bereits vor der Einfügung ins Buch, d.h. die Reihenfolge der Völker konnte beliebig sein. Die jetzt in MT erkennbare Ordnung entspricht aber der der Bechererzählung in Jer 25. Diese Entsprechung zeige, daß MT (nachträglich) daran angepaßt wurde und G als *lectio difficilior* den Vorrang verdiene. Dieser Überlegung fügt Janzen noch als Argumente an: 1) Jer 46(26),27-28 sei durch die Umstellung in MT zum vorhergehenden Ägyptenspruch gekommen, wo es nicht in den Kontext passe, statt wie in G vor dem Spruch über Babel zu stehen, zu dem es eine Randglosse darstelle. 2) Die (in G fehlenden) Endungen Jer 48,47; 51,64 seien Glossen, von denen die erste dem Ende der G-Ordnung der Völkersprüche entspricht.

Das erste Argument ist zum Teil zutreffend. Es gibt einen thematischen Bezug zum Beginn der Sprüche über Babel. Jer 50 (27),2-5 sprechen vom Fall Babels und als dessen Folge von der Heimkehr der Kinder Israels. Doch sei auf die Verschiedenheiten in Vokabular, Vorstellung und Ablauf zwischen 46(26),27-28 und 50(27),2-5 hingewiesen: Die Anrede ist einmal (mein Knecht) Jakob und Israel, zum anderen Söhne Israels, Söhne Judas. Die Heimkehr wird nicht mit 'zurückkehren', sondern mit 'kommen' benannt. In vv. 27-28 liegt das Schwergewicht auf Gottes Tun und der daraus sich ergebenden Furchtlosigkeit, in vv. 2-5 sind menschliche Subjekte und der Fall, bzw. der Weg dominierend. Vv. 27-28 laufen auf eine Einschränkung (das 'Züchtigen') zu, vv. 2-5 (und auch die folgenden Verse) dagegen entwickeln immer hoffnungsvollere Bilder. — Auch wenn sicherlich vom Thema der Heimkehr eine Nähe zwischen beiden Texten besteht, so ist die Ausarbeitung doch zu verschieden, um zwischen beiden einen direkten Zusammenhang anzunehmen.



Wie steht es mit dem Kontext von MT Jer 46? Sowohl 46,14-26 wie Jer 47 entwickeln mit sehr intensiven, vielfältigen Bildern<sup>(6)</sup> die drohende Zerstörung. Sie wird als Gericht Jahwes interpretiert<sup>(7)</sup>, das durch eine feindliche Macht aus dem Norden<sup>(8)</sup> eintritt. Wiederum, wie zu Jer 50, gibt es keine Zusammenhänge über dieselben Worte. Doch die Beschreibung des Gerichtes läßt die Aufforderung an Israel, sich nicht zu fürchten, hier eher verständlich erscheinen als im Zusammenhang mit Jer 50. Desgleichen besteht eine Verbindung über das Tun Jahwes: V. 28 redet wie der Kontext von seinem Vernichtungshandeln, nachdem zuvor, im Kontrast und zur Heraushebung Israels, Jahwes Retten und Mitsein (v. 27) genannt wurde. Schließlich wird durch die vorausgehende Erwähnung des Königs von Babel (in v. 26; fehlt in G) und der späteren Wiederbesiedlung Ägyptens<sup>(9)</sup> thematisch die Rettung aus dem fernen Land bzw. der Gefangenschaft und das sichere Wohnen von v. 27 vorbereitet. — Trotz fehlender Beziehungen über gleiche Ausdrücke ist MT Jer 46,27-28 besser im Kontext verankert als die Parallelstelle 26,27-28 in G; die Beziehungen zum vorausgehenden Ägyptenspruch (und zu Jer 47 MT) sind wesentlich stärker als die zu den Worten über Babel.

Das zweite Argument ist auch umkehrbar: Die zum zweiten Endungssystem (siehe unten bei III) gehörenden beiden Verse mit 'bis hierher', die die etwas außerhalb der sonstigen Völkerworte stehenden Sprüche gegen Babel in Jer 50–51 stärker mit diesen verbinden, mußten in G im einen Fall weggelassen werden, weil nach 28,64 die Sprüche Jeremias weitergingen, und im anderen Fall fielen sie zusammen mit der davorstehenden Heilsverheißung für Moab weg. Die Beobachtung Janzens, die MT-Ordnung stimme mit Jer 25 überein, ist nicht von der Hand zu weisen, doch kann diese Übereinstim-

(<sup>6</sup>) Nur einige Bilder/Ausdrücke von Jer 46: das Schwert frißt (v. 14), umstoßen, am Boden liegen (vv. 15-16), Tabor und Karmel (v. 18), Kuh, Bremse, Mastkälber (vv. 20-21), Schlange, Heuschrecke (vv. 22-23); in Jer 47: Wasser (v. 2), Reiter und Wagen, schlaffe Hände (v. 3), Glatze, sich Einschnitte machen (v. 5), Schwert (v. 6); dazu die 'Höreindrücke' durch die Zitate in 46,14-17 und קל 'Stimme' in 46,22; 47,3.

(<sup>7</sup>) Mehrfach ist Jahwe Subjekt aggressiven Tuns: 46,15.25; 47,4.(6).7.

(<sup>8</sup>) צפון 'Norden' in 46,20.24; 47,2, möglicherweise konkretisiert in der Heeresmacht des babylonischen Königs Nebukadnezar in 46,26.

(<sup>9</sup>) Allerdings ausgedrückt mit שכן 'wohnen', während in v. 27 andere Verben verwendet werden.

mung bei einem nachträglichen Anhängen der Völkerworte an das entstehende Jeremiabuch, wie es auch Janzen annimmt, leicht erklärt werden.

P.-M. Bogaert hat in vielen Veröffentlichungen zum Verständnis der Beziehungen zwischen MT und G Entscheidendes beigetragen. Darin vertritt er mehrfach die Überzeugung, G komme in der Stellung und Anordnung der Sprüche Priorität gegenüber MT zu<sup>(10)</sup>. Er sieht die Frage der Stellung der Völkerworte im größeren Zusammenhang der Redaktion des Jeremiabuches. In G ist Baruch "der bevorzugte Zeuge der Prophetie Jeremias und ihrer Erfüllung"<sup>(11)</sup>, die Verheißung an ihn stehe am Ende wie eine Unterschrift<sup>(12)</sup> (G Jer 51,31-35). In MT dagegen sei Jeremia als Autorität bereits anerkannt, deswegen würden seine eigenen Worte an den Schluß gestellt<sup>(13)</sup> und sie bezeugten so am Ende wie eine Signatur seine Botschaft. — Selbst wenn man die Deutung dessen, was am Ende steht, mit 'Unterschrift' einmal akzeptiert<sup>(14)</sup>, so stellt sich doch die Frage: Wer gibt wem Autorität? Der Prophet seinem Sekretär, oder umgekehrt? Nach dem Untergang Jerusalems, als man die Worte Jeremias eingetroffen sehen konnte, brauchten diese keine weitere Bestätigung von außen. Eine 'Unterschrift' mit Baruch hätte den zuvor stehenden Worten kaum mehr Autorität verschafft.

Was die Anordnung der Fremdvölkersprüche betrifft, so zeigt Bogaert auf, daß der Spruch gegen die Philister in MT Jer 47 mit den Veränderungen zuvor beim Spruch gegen Ägypten verbunden und deswegen an der dortigen Stelle sekundär sei<sup>(15)</sup>. Durch "bevor der Pharao Gaza schlug" in Jer 47,1 werde das Wort gegen die Phi-

<sup>(10)</sup> BOGAERT, "Le personnage", 73 und 76; "Relecture et déplacement", 139-145; "L'Organisation des grands recueils prophétiques", *The Book of Isaiah. Le livre d'Isaïe* (Hrsg. J. VERMEYLEN) (BETL 81; Leuven 1989) 147-153, vor allem 147 mit Anm. 4.

<sup>(11)</sup> BOGAERT, "De Baruch à Jérémie", 172.

<sup>(12)</sup> H. M. I. GEVARYAHU, "Biblical colophons: A source for the 'biography' of authors, texts and books", VTS 28 (Leiden 1975) 42-59, sieht in der Stellung der Kolophone am Ende ihren ursprünglichen Platz (S. 44). Leider war mir sein einschlägiger Artikel: "Baruch the Scribe" (FS Shazar, 1973) nicht zugänglich.

<sup>(13)</sup> BOGAERT, "Le personnage", 75 und Anm. 4.

<sup>(14)</sup> Doch findet sich diese in den meisten prophetischen Büchern am Anfang. Außerdem ist Jer 52, wenngleich wohl aus späterer Zeit, in diesem Zusammenhang nicht zu vernachlässigen.

<sup>(15)</sup> BOGAERT, "Relecture et déplacement", 144.

lister über die Erwähnung des 'Pharao' an den Ägyptenspruch in Jer 46 angeschlossen, wobei dort noch vv. 25-26 für diesen Anschluß verändert wurden. — Bogaert geht von der Voraussetzung aus, daß, was MT an Plus bietet, Zufügung sei<sup>(16)</sup>. Das wird von ihm nirgends bewiesen, setzt in sich aber schon die Abhängigkeit des hebräischen Textes voraus, die dann gefolgert wird. Bogaert sieht richtig die Beziehungen zwischen dem Ende des Ägyptenspruchs und dem Beginn des folgenden Wortes über die Philister. Doch ist grundsätzlich zu fragen, ob bei einem Text mit interner Kohärenz, mit Verbindungen zwischen zwei aufeinanderfolgenden Abschnitten deswegen schon deren sekundäre Zusammenfügung erwiesen ist. Die wesentliche Beziehung zwischen Jer 46 und 47 scheint darüberhinaus nicht in der Erwähnung des Pharao, sondern in der geographischen Abfolge der Fremdvölker zu liegen.

Der Hauptgrund für die mangelnde Beweiskraft der Ausführungen von Janzen und Bogaert liegt darin, daß im Argumentationsgang die Überlegenheit einer in G noch in Wortlaut und Anordnung besser bewahrten hebräischen Vorlage gegenüber MT (oder seinen Vorlagen) vorausgesetzt wird. Damit entsteht ein Zirkelschluß<sup>(17)</sup>. Nach meinem Wissen ist A. Schenker einer der wenigen, die diesen Kreis erkannt haben und ein unvoreingenommenes Abwägen in dieser Frage versuchen<sup>(18)</sup>. Sein Artikel behandelt die dreimal vorkommende Benennung Nebukadnezars mit 'mein Knecht' in MT Jer 25,9; 27,6; 43,10. In G fehlt diese Bezeichnung. Bei Jer 27,6 wägt Schenker in beiden Richtungen ab, was für MT und was für G spricht; bei zwei Details verläßt er sich dann auf die Untersuchungen

<sup>(16)</sup> Das Plus von G in 29,7 "für die Übrigbleibenden" wird jedoch nicht besprochen, ebensowenig das fehlende 'Wehe!' am Beginn von 29,6; vgl. dazu auch Jer 30,7 MT (37,6 G).

<sup>(17)</sup> Das gilt auch für L. LABERGE, "Jérémie 25,1-14: Dieu et Juda ou Jérémie et tous les peuples", *ScEs* 36 (1984) 45-66.

<sup>(18)</sup> A. SCHENKER, "Nebukadnezars Metamorphose vom Unterjocher zum Gottesknecht. Das Bild Nebukadnezars und einige mit ihm zusammenhängende Unterschiede in den beiden Jeremia-Rezensionen", *RB* 89 (1982) 498-527. — Auch W. MCKANE, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*. Vol. 1 (Edinburgh 1986) 621f, überlegt zu Jer 25,1-7 in beiden Richtungen; doch die Ablehnung der Argumente W. Thiels paart sich mit der Annahme, der kürzere griechische Text sei der ursprünglichere, woraus er dann auf Erweiterungen und Änderungen im MT schließt. Dieses Ergebnis wird aber nicht auf der Basis eines unvoreingenommenen Textvergleichs erreicht.

von Janzen und Tov und entscheidet sich, G den Vorzug zu geben<sup>(19)</sup>. Er steht selbst dann noch zu dieser Entscheidung, wenn er im Gefolge feststellen muß: G Jer 34,5 (= 27,6 MT) "ihm zu dienen" kann nicht ursprünglich sein, denn die Erde würde dem König von Babel dienen<sup>(20)</sup>. Wenn er schließlich für denselben Vers angibt, gegen G ('Erde' im Singular) werde der Plural 'Länder' vorausgesetzt, und dazu davor 'alle diese'<sup>(21)</sup>, dann sind wir genau bei MT, dessen Formulierung vom Sinn her als notwendig erachtet wird, um nicht in Widersprüche zu geraten. — Die von Schenker vollzogene Detailanalyse für die Stelle MT Jer 27,6, die mit der Einleitung zu den Fremdvölkerworten 25,8-14 über die Bezeichnung Nebukadnezars als 'mein Knecht' verbunden ist, weist also G Änderung und Auslassung nach. Das betrifft einen Einzelfall<sup>(22)</sup>, der zudem nicht innerhalb der Völkerworte steht. Doch zeigt Schenkers Vorgehen beispielhaft auf, daß in beiden Richtungen zu überlegen ist. Dies soll im folgenden bei Jer 25 und den Fremdvölkersprüchen geschehen.

(19) SCHENKER, "Nebukadnezars Metamorphose", 501-502, Anm. 9. Schenker stützt sich auf Tov, "Exegetical Notes". Dieser aber gesteht offen (S. 77), nach der Darlegung einiger Gründe: "The present paper is based upon the assumption that the short LXX text of Jer reflects a short Hebrew text". Er übernimmt dabei seinerseits die Sicht von J. G. Janzen (S. 74).

(20) SCHENKER, "Nebukadnezars Metamorphose", 508.

(21) SCHENKER, "Nebukadnezars Metamorphose", 521. Auch Tov, "Exegetical Notes", 83, rechnet mit dem Plural 'Länder' und vielleicht (mit Fragezeichen, S. 79) auch noch mit 'diese' in der hebräischen Vorlage.

(22) Schenker erörtert noch viele weitere Verschiebungen zwischen MT und G genau, bleibt aber seiner einmal getroffenen Entscheidung treu. Doch mehrfach riecht die Version von G nach Anpassung oder Glättung: S. 510-511 diskutiert er das Fehlen der Überschrift von MT Jer 27,1 an der entsprechenden Stelle Jer 34 in G. Diese Überschrift steht aber im Widerspruch zu 28(35),1. Was ist wahrscheinlicher: im Nachhinein den Widerspruch zu tilgen oder ihn hineinzufügen? — S. 513-517 bespricht Schenker Jer 25,8-14 und kommt zu dem Ergebnis, MT habe die ursprüngliche, symmetrische Struktur, die in G noch bewahrt werde, durch zwei Eingriffe in v. 11b verändert. Aber was wird eher zum anderen geändert, das Symmetrische ins Asymmetrische, oder umgekehrt? Außerdem enthält MT Jer 25,8-14 auch ein symmetrisches Element gegen G durch das 'Dienen' in vv. 12 und 14. — S. 523-525 zeigt Schenker bei Jer 43(50),10-13 eine formal komplexere Struktur in G als in MT auf. Daß G damit aber inhaltlich einfacher und natürlicher wird, erregt doch auch Verdacht.

## II. Der Befund in Jer 25

Für den ersten Teil von Jer 25, nämlich vv. 1-14, gibt es bereits einschlägige Untersuchungen, was das Verhältnis von MT und G betrifft<sup>(23)</sup>. Sie zeigen, daß MT im Unterschied zu G verallgemeinere, den Blick beim Gericht von Juda weg auch auf die anderen Völker lenke<sup>(24)</sup> und dabei Nebukadnezzar sogar im Mund Jahwes als "mein Knecht" benennt. Bevor darauf eingegangen werden kann, gilt unser Interesse der Nahtstelle Jer 25,12-15. Vv. 12-13(14) bilden sowohl für MT wie für G den Abschluß des ersten Teils von Jer 25, mit vv. 14-15 gehen bei beiden die Texte auseinander.

## 1. Der Übergang 25,12-15

25,5	אדמה	ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
25,9	על-הארץ הזאת	ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ταύτην
25,11	כל-הארץ הזאת	πᾶσα ἡ γῆ
25,12	ועל-ארץ כשדים	
25,13	על-הארץ ההיא	ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην

Jer 25,12 zeigt neben "am König von Babel" und "ihre Schuld" noch "und am Land der Chaldäer" als weiteres Plus von MT<sup>(25)</sup>.

<sup>(23)</sup> Um die Mitte dieses Jahrhunderts ist J. P. HYATT, "The Deuteronomic Edition of Jeremiah", *Vanderbilt Studies in the Humanities*. Vol. I (Hrsg. R. C. BEATTY u.a.) (Nashville 1951) 71-95, knapp auf die Unterschiede zwischen G und MT in Jer 25 eingegangen (S. 85-86 und 90). Weit ausführlicher werden sie diskutiert von SCHENKER, "Nebukadnezzars Metamorphose", und von LABERGE, "Jérémie 25,1-14"; siehe dazu auch die ausführliche Textdiskussion bei MCKANE, *Jeremiah*, 618-633; und auch die Kommentare von J. BRIGHT, *Jeremiah* (AB 21; New York 1965) 156-164; R. P. CARROLL, *Jeremiah. A Commentary* (OTL; London 1986) 489-496; sowie W. L. HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 1* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1986) 662-667, bei ihm auch weitere Literatur auf S. 661, 670 und 677.

<sup>(24)</sup> LABERGE, "Jérémie 25,1-14", 62; B. GOSSE, "La malédiction contre Babylone de Jérémie 51,59-64 et les rédactions du livre de Jérémie", *ZAW* 98 (1986) 383-399, besonders 388-391; SCHENKER, "Nebukadnezzars Metamorphose", 518, spricht von 'Babylonisierung'.

<sup>(25)</sup> MT nimmt mit ארץ wohl nicht auf das Land (fem.), sondern auf das weiter vorn stehende נ 'Volk' (mask.) Bezug, ebenso G mit αὐτούς 'sie', das trotz Plural vom Sinn her auf 'Volk' — als Kollektivbegriff im Singular stehend — bezogen werden kann. — Anders F. MOVERS, *Utriusque recensionis Vaticiniorum Ieremiae* (Hamburg 1837) 27-28; er meint, ארץ müsse auf הארץ bezogen werden, trotz des femininen Geschlechts.

Jer 25,13 fährt fort “und ich bringe über jenes Land alle meine Worte”. In MT ist “jenes Land” ohne Schwierigkeit auf das Land der Chaldäer im Vers zuvor zu beziehen. G dagegen aktiviert mit demselben Ausdruck eine Stichwortkette, die von v. 5 “und ihr werdet wohnen auf dem Land”<sup>(26)</sup> über v. 9 “und ich bringe sie über/ gegen dieses Land” bis v. 11 “und das ganze Land wird zur Vernichtung sein” reicht und jedesmal das Gebiet von Jerusalem und Juda meint. Doch bereitet der Rückbezug auf diese Stichwortkette erhebliche Schwierigkeiten durch den dazwischenstehenden v. 12, der von Gottes Gericht an ‘jenem Volk’ spricht. Damit ist (in G und MT) nicht die Einwohnerschaft Judas gemeint<sup>(27)</sup>, sondern ein fremdes Volk, was den Übergang zum Gericht an einem anderen Land (und nicht mehr an Juda) bedeuten könnte. G ist also zweideutig: vom Ausdruck her auf Juda, vom Kontext dagegen auf ein anderes Land zu beziehen.

25,13 Und ich werde bringen  
über jenes Land alle meine  
Worte  
welche ich gegen es gesprochen  
habe  
alles, was aufgeschrieben  
ist in diesem Buch  
was weissagte Jeremia über  
alle Völker

25,14 Denn es werden arbeiten  
mit ihnen, auch (mit) ihnen, viele  
Völker und große Könige, und ich  
vergelte ihnen nach ihrem Tun  
und nach dem Werk ihrer Hände

25,15 Ja, so hat Jahwe, der Gott  
Israels, zu mir gesprochen: Nimm  
diesen Becher...

25,13 Und ich werde bringen  
über jenes Land alle meine  
Worte  
welche ich gegen es gesprochen  
habe  
alles, was aufgeschrieben  
ist in diesem Buch  
25,14 Was weissagte Jeremia  
über die Völker von Elam:

25,15 So spricht der Herr: Er  
(man) zerbreche den Bogen  
Elams...

<sup>(26)</sup> MT verwendet in v. 5 nicht ארץ, sondern אדמה ‘Boden, Land, Erde’.

<sup>(27)</sup> In 25,1-2 MT steht עם (und nicht נַ; parallel dazu stehen in G λαός und ἔθνος gegeneinander. Das Vorkommen der jeweils zuletzt genannten Wörter in vv. 9.11 im Plural verkompliziert die Bezugnahme.

Auch bezüglich Jer 25,13d unterscheiden sich die beiden Versionen: "Was weissagte Jeremia über alle Völker" von MT steht in G in v. 14 abgesetzt vom Vorhergehenden und ohne 'alle' <sup>(28)</sup>, dafür mit τα Αίλαμ 'von Elam'. Während im MT die dreifache Bestimmung des Strafumfangs <sup>(29)</sup> aufgrund der inneren Spannungen zwischen ihnen zu einer Unschärfe, darüberhinaus aber vor allem zu einer ungerechten Vergeltung führt, weil an einem Land die Drohsprüche gegen alle Völker wahr werden, ist die griechische Version erstens gerechter und zweitens einfacher: Das Land trifft nur, was 'gegen es' gesprochen wurde; und die beiden Bestimmungen (v. 13b+c) lassen sich ohne stärkere Spannungen als einander ergänzend verstehen.

Jer 25,14 lautet in MT: "Denn es werden arbeiten <sup>(30)</sup> mit ihnen, auch (mit) ihnen, viele Völker und große Könige, und ich ver-

<sup>(28)</sup> BOGAERT, "L'Organisation", 147-153, im besonderen 150 mit Anm. 12, sieht, wie auch andere, darin den Titel für den ganzen Abschnitt (der Fremdvölkersprüche). Die Nennung Elams sei davon abzutrennen. — Daß Jer 25,14 G Einleitung für die ganze Sektion ist, wird richtig gesehen. Das ergibt sich auch aus dem Vergleich mit Jer 46,1 MT, wo ebenfalls 'Jeremia' und 'über die Völker' erwähnt wird. Doch mit der Abtrennung von 'Elam' ist es nicht so einfach, weil ähnliche, isolierte Titel (G Jer 29,8 für Idumäa; 31,1 für Moab) sonst bei G im Dativ stehen. Es ist deshalb eher anzunehmen, daß Jer 25,14 G eine Verbindung von allgemeinem und speziellem Titel darstellt, also zugleich alle Völkerworte und auch das gegen Elam einführt.

<sup>(29)</sup> V. 13b "alle meine Worte, die ich gegen es gesprochen habe"; v. 13c "alles, was aufgeschrieben ist in diesem Buch"; und v. 13d. — Die drei Bestimmungen weisen wohl auf redaktionelle Arbeit hin.

<sup>(30)</sup> Eigentlich steht Perfekt "haben gearbeitet", doch vom Sinn her, nämlich dem zukünftigen Gericht, ist Futur gefordert. BHS Anm. b zur Stelle schlägt auch Präformativ vor, das durch Haplographie (nach ך) ausgefallen sein könnte; ebenso lesen die modernen Übersetzungen der Herderbibel, EÜ, RSV, TOB, NBE u.a. Diese Lösung vertritt auch McKANE, *Jeremiah*, 623, unter Verweis auf Raschi und Kimchi.

Die Verwendung der Form *qatal* für Zukunft ist zwar ungewöhnlich, aber nicht unmöglich (Joüon § 112 e.g.h). Auch nicht auszuschließen ist eine redaktionelle Verbindung mit Jer 27,7b. Von diesem, unserer Stelle ganz ähnlichen Satz (mit *w<sup>e</sup>qatal*) könnte durch Wegfall des Waw aufgrund des einleitenden 'denn' die Formulierung im Perfekt stammen. Auch sonst hängen Jer 25 und 27 mehrfach zusammen; siehe dazu SCHENKER, "Nebukadnezars Metamorphose".

Weitere, möglicherweise redaktionelle Beziehungen zeigen sich zwischen Jer 25,14b und den Sprüchen gegen Babel, besonders 50,29 und 51,24.

gelte ihnen nach ihrem Tun und nach dem Werk ihrer Hände". Dieser Satz hat in G nirgends eine Entsprechung; als v. 14 wird die oben besprochene, annähernd mit MT v. 13d gleiche Einleitung für den Elamspruch und für die Völkerworte insgesamt gezählt. Der Unterschied besteht darin, daß MT mit v. 14 zu einem Abschluß kommt, der nach vv. 12-13 als letzte Stufe des Gerichtes an den Chaldäern deren Untertansein beschreibt. In G dagegen hat v. 14 Ein- und Überleitungsfunktion; das in vv. 12-13 über 'jenes Volk' und 'jenes Land' angekündigte Gericht wird in vv. 14-20 mit dem Spruch gegen Elam konkretisiert.

Jer 25,15 MT setzt nach der Setuma neu mit der Botenformel ein. Auch das Reden von Jeremia in der 1. Person hebt von den Versen zuvor ab, wo über Jeremia in der 3. Person gesprochen wurde. Der Inhalt der folgenden 'Vision'<sup>(31)</sup>, Jahwes Zornesbecher, den Jeremia allen Völkern zu trinken geben soll, zeigt als bildliche Darstellung des kommenden Gerichts zwar eine Verbindung mit 25,1-14, ist aber in der sprachlichen Ausgestaltung selbständig. Jer 25,15-38 MT kann so als nächste eigene Einheit<sup>(32)</sup> angesehen werden, ebenso wie Jer 25,(14.)15-20 in G.

Wie lassen sich die oben genannten Unterschiede deuten? Wir haben gesehen, daß MT nicht glatt verläuft (אחי 'es' in v. 12, die drei Bestimmungen des Strafumfanges in v. 13, das Perfekt am Beginn von v. 14). Darin scheint sich die Arbeit der Redaktion(en) zu spiegeln<sup>(33)</sup>. So entsteht, nachdem 25,1-7 den Grund für Jahwes Gericht genannt hat, in 25,8-14 die deutliche Ankündigung eines doppelten Gerichts: am Volk von Juda in 25,8-11, und an Babel in 25,12-14, wobei letzteres in eigenartiger Weise mit dem Gericht an allen Völkern (v. 13d) verbunden ist.

<sup>(31)</sup> W. RUDOLPH, *Jeremia* (HAT 12; Tübingen 31968) 163, benennt Jer 25,15-29 als 'Bechervision'. A. WEISER, *Das Buch Jeremia* (ATD 20/21; Göttingen 61969) 223, verwendet denselben Ausdruck, aber nur für 25,15-16. Doch kommt der Ausdruck 'Vision', wie auch verwandte Wörter (z.B. 'schauen'), im Text selbst nicht vor.

<sup>(32)</sup> Die Verse 30-38 gehören als Erläuterung (so RUDOLPH, *Jeremia*, 167) zur Bechervision dazu und formen zusammen mit ihr die 'Ankündigung des Gerichts über die Völker' (163).

<sup>(33)</sup> Offenbar wurde die Technik verwendet, Stichworte aufzugreifen: Vv. 11-12 sind verbunden durch '70 Jahre' und 'der König von Babel'; vv. 12-13 über 'das Land der Chaldäer' bzw. 'jenes Land'; vv. 13-15 durch 'alle/viele Völker'.



G, die zwar einige Ausdrücke weniger hat als H, ist deswegen noch nicht leichter verständlich. Probleme bereiten die Bezugnahme von 'jenes Land' in v. 13 und die Überschrift v. 14 mit ihrer Spannung zwischen 'Völker' und 'Elam'. Im Aufbau ähnlich wie MT (25,1-7 Grund für das Gericht Gottes; 25,8-13 doppeltes Gericht an Juda und 'jenem Volk/Land'), unterscheidet sich G vor allem in der (bis v. 13 einschließlich) fehlenden Identifizierung des fremden Volkes: Sie nennt nur in v. 9 ein 'Volk<sup>(34)</sup> vom Norden', ohne es näher zu bestimmen. Dadurch ist der Text für sich offener, und ein glatter Übergang zum Elamspruch möglich. Die Zweideutigkeit von 'jenes Land' in v. 13 jedoch warnt davor, in G den ursprünglicheren, einfacheren Text zu sehen.

## 2. Die *Bechervision* Jer 25(32),15-38

MT setzt die Ankündigung des doppelten Gerichtes fort mit der sogenannten *Bechervision*. In zwei Durchgängen, dem Trinken (25,15-26) und den begleitenden Worten (25,27-38), wird Jahwes Strafe an allen Völkern beschrieben. Dabei zeigt sich jeweils eine Stufung. Zuerst kommt Jerusalem (und Juda; in vv. 18.29), dann die fremden Völker, die in 25,19-26 namentlich aufgezählt, in 25,30-32 allgemein benannt werden. Die Zweiteilung und die Reihenfolge des Gerichts von 25,8-14 setzt sich also in der Vision fort: Nach Juda trifft es die fremden Völker, für die zuvor Babel exemplarisch stand<sup>(35)</sup>.

Wenn wir einen kurzen Blick auf den weiteren Aufbau von Jeremia MT werfen, so kann man darin die Ausfaltung des hier in Ankündigung und Vision vorgestellten doppelten Gerichts sehen. Jer 26-45 beschreiben als ersten Schritt das Schicksal Judas mit der Zerstörung Jerusalems. Als zweiter Schritt folgt darauf in Jer 46-51 das Schicksal der Völker, endend mit dem Gericht über Babel Jer 50-51. Jer 52, mit der erneuten Schilderung des Falles Jerusalems teils Wiederholung zu Jer 39, hat wohl die Funktion, am Ende des Buches den Blick von den fremden Völkern wieder zurückzulenken auf das Schicksal Judas. Jojachins Begnadigung zum Schluß des Kapi-

<sup>(34)</sup> Im Griechischen steht πατρία. Damit ist ein weiteres Problem der Bezugnahme verbunden: Das in G v. 12 erwähnte τό ἔθνος ἔκεινο 'jenes Volk' kann sich vom Sinn her nur auf πατρία in v. 9 beziehen; dazwischen stehen aber in vv. 9.11 zwei Vorkommen von ἔθνος im Plural.

<sup>(35)</sup> Das könnte den Zusammenhang von v. 13d 'über alle Völker' mit dem Land der Chaldäer erklären.

tels gibt nicht nur für Jer 52, sondern für das ganze Buch einen hoffnungsvollen Abschluß.

G hat die Bechervision als Abschluß der Fremdvölkersprüche in Jer 32. Die als v. 13 vorangestellte Überschrift "was Jeremia weissagte über alle Völker" entspricht bis aufs Wort MT Jer 25,13d<sup>(36)</sup>. Doch steht diese 'Überschrift' in einer Spannung zum unmittelbar folgenden v. 15 "so spricht der Herr, der Gott Israels", insofern sie Jeremia (ähnlich wie in 25,14-15 G) vor seinem Auftraggeber nennt, ein Vorgehen, das die hebräische Entsprechungsstelle nicht aufweist<sup>(37)</sup>.

Die Bechererzählung hat in G alle Eigentümlichkeiten aufzuweisen, die auch bei der Gegenüberstellung der beiden Versionen (MT und G) in anderen Texten auffallen<sup>(38)</sup>. Wir finden weitgehend wörtliches Übersetzen, bis zur Transkription<sup>(39)</sup>; weiters das Bemühen um lautliche Äquivalenz<sup>(40)</sup>; verschiedene Übersetzung derselben Ausdrücke<sup>(41)</sup> und schließlich gleiche Übersetzung von Ver-

<sup>(36)</sup> Dieser Überschrift am nächsten kommt G Jer 25,14, das ja auch annähernde Übersetzung von MT Jer 25,13d zu sein scheint; siehe oben unter II, 1. Jer 25,14 G erfüllt dabei mehrere Funktionen: Es ist Übersetzung für 25,13d MT. Zugleich ist es Einleitung für den Elamspruch, bei dem es die Schwierigkeit des hebräischen Textanfangs (MT Jer 49,34) löst. Zusammen mit 32,13 G, das auch rückblickend verstanden werden kann, bildet es eine Art Rahmen um die Fremdvölkersprüche.

<sup>(37)</sup> Jer 25,13d MT steht im Kontext und in Abhängigkeit von Gottes Sprechen in 25,13b; und in 49,34 heißt es "was erging (als?) Wort Jahwes an Jeremia ...". — Der eher eigenständige Charakter von G 25,14; 32,13 als Überschriften tritt durch diesen Vergleich mit MT stärker hervor.

<sup>(38)</sup> Ausführliche Zusammenstellungen der Abweichungen zwischen MT und G finden sich bei SCHOLZ, *Der masorethische Text*. Grundlegend für jede Beschäftigung mit dem G-Text von Jer ist die Ausgabe von J. ZIEGLER, *Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Göttingensis editum*. Vol. XV Ieremias. Baruch. Threni. Epistula Ieremiae. (Göttingen 1957; <sup>2</sup>1976), sowie vom selben Autor: *Beiträge zur Ieremias-Septuaginta* (MSU 6; Göttingen 1958). — Nicht nur zu Jer, sondern zum ganzen AT trägt F. Wutz, allerdings auf der Basis einer Transkriptionstheorie, eine Fülle vergleichender Beobachtungen zusammen: F. WUTZ, *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus* (BWAT 34; Stuttgart 1933).

<sup>(39)</sup> V. 30 αἰδᾶδ für den Kelterruf 'Hedad!'. —

<sup>(40)</sup> Vv. 34.36 werden Ausdrücke der Wurzel 𐤁𐤏 'jammern, klagen' mit ἀλαλάζω 'schreien', bzw. ἀλαλαγμός wiedergegeben.

<sup>(41)</sup> 𐤁𐤏 im Plural, 'Fürsten', wird in v. 18 mit ἄρχοντες, in v. 19 mit μεγιστᾶνες übersetzt. — Bei dieser und der folgenden Anmerkung nehmen wir an, daß die hebräische Vorlage von G nicht von der für MT differierte.

schiedenem<sup>(42)</sup>. Ähnliches gilt bezüglich der Textdifferenzen. Wir treffen Personenwechsel an<sup>(43)</sup>, Ergänzungen bzw. Kürzungen<sup>(44)</sup>, andere Wiedergabe<sup>(45)</sup>.

Auch lassen sich manche Tendenzen beobachten. In G ist Gott milder gezeichnet<sup>(46)</sup>, auch sonst ist manches schwächer formuliert<sup>(47)</sup>. Typisch Hebräisches wird in griechische Bilder übersetzt<sup>(48)</sup>. Einerseits enthält G weniger Wiederholungen<sup>(49)</sup>, andererseits mehr<sup>(50)</sup>.

Wenn auch Sprache und Inhalt der Bechervision von G im wesentlichen mit MT übereinstimmen, so bewirkt die andere Stellung in G doch eine verschiedene Funktion. Am Ende der Fremdvölkersprüche ist die Bechererzählung in Jer 32 G bildhafte Zusammenfassung für diese. Damit kommt die Ankündigung von Gottes Gericht an den Völkern, das mit Juda (25,8-11) begonnen und sich dann an andere Völker (G 25,12-31,44) gewandt hatte, zu einem Abschluß. Der Einsatz von Jer 33 G mit Jeremias Tempelpredigt geht (wie Jer 26 MT) über zur Vollstreckung des Gerichts an Jerusalem und Juda.

(42) ἐξέμεά 'ausspeien' steht in v. 27 für σπ 'speien', doch bereits in v. 16 für ~~σπ~~ Hitpolel 'sich geräuschvoll erbrechen' (HALAT 192).

(43) In v. 30 läßt MT Gott, G die Winzer den Kelterruf ausstoßen. In v. 31 übergibt nach MT Gott die Frevler dem Schwert, G formuliert im Passiv "die Frevler wurden gegeben ...".

(44) In diesem Text hat überwiegend MT an einigen Stellen ein Plus aufzuweisen, G enthält nur selten (in v. 20 'seine' und in v. 29 'auf') ein Wort mehr als MT. Das Mehr von MT betrifft vor allem einige zusätzliche Könige in vv. 20-26 und einige teils typisch hebräische Ausdrücke (wie 'siehe' und 'Spruch Jahwe Zebaoths' in v. 29, Gottes 'Wohnung' in v. 30, usw.).

(45) V. 25 MT 'Meder', in G 'Perser'; v. 26 MT 'alle Könige des Nordens', in G 'alle Könige vom Ostwind', u.a.

(46) In v. 30 schreit nicht er den Kelterruf, sondern die Leser; in v. 31 straft nicht er; in v. 33 sind es nicht seine Erschlagenen, sondern nur seine Verwundeten.

(47) V. 28 'nicht wollen' für 'weigern'; v. 30 'den göttlichen Willen kundtun' für 'brüllen'; in v. 33 fehlt bei den Toten, daß sie nicht betrauert und nicht gesammelt werden; in v. 37 'aufhören' statt 'vertilgt, verwüstet werden'.

(48) Der Zorneswein wird zum ungemischten Wein (v. 15), der Trauergestus, sich zu wälzen, wird mit 'schlagen, trauern' übersetzt (v. 34), ...

(49) In v. 29 fehlt das dritte 'ungestraft lassen', in v. 30 das dritte Brüllen, in vv. 35-36 ist die Reihenfolge von Böcken und Schafen anders, in vv. 37-38 stehen Glut und Zorn nur einmal.

(50) Neben 'ausspeien' in vv. 16, 27 noch 'und alle Gemischten' in vv. 20, 24 und vor allem die 'Böcke', viermal in vv. 34-36.

G bietet durch ihren Aufbau eine logischere und weniger Brüche enthaltende Reihenfolge als MT. Im hebräischen Text finden sich drei Stellen mit abruptem Themawechsel: die Übergänge Jer 25–26, 45–46 und 51–52. Im Griechischen sind diese 'Brüche' auf zwei reduziert: Jer 32–33 und 51–52. Dem sonst in Prophetenbüchern anzutreffenden dreiteiligen Schema, Unheil gegen das eigene Volk, Unheil gegen fremde Völker, Heil für das eigene Volk<sup>(51)</sup> fügt sich die G-Anordnung mit den Fremdvölkersprüchen in der mittleren Sektion besser ein als MT mit deren Stellung am Ende — auch wenn dabei zu beachten ist, daß die dritte Sektion, überschrieben mit 'Heil', nur sehr unzulänglich auf Jeremia zutrifft. Auch macht MT in bezug auf die Ansage des Gerichts einen Schritt zurück: Nachdem in Jer 26–45 dessen Vollstreckung an Jerusalem berichtet wurde, bringen Jer 46–51 erneut (nach Jer 25) Gerichtsankündigung. — Diese Beobachtungen stellen vor die Frage, ob die 'logischere' Reihenfolge (von G) die ursprüngliche ist, oder ob die mehr Brüche aufweisende Anordnung von MT eher den Vorzug verdient.

Sowohl G wie MT zeigen je eigenen Gestaltungswillen in Jer 25. G bietet einen eleganten Übergang von der Ansage des Gerichtes Gottes an Juda zu der über die fremden Völker; diese beginnen mit dem Spruch gegen Elam und enden mit der Bechervision in Jer 32. MT zieht die Konzeption des doppelten Gerichts in Ankündigung (25,1–14), Bechervision (25,15–38) und Ausführung (Jer 26–45 und 46–51) konsequent durch, wobei die Distanz der Fremdvölkersprüche in Jer 46–51 zu ihrem Prolog in Jer 25,15–38 sehr weit wird.

### III. Die Fremdvölkersprüche

Von ihrer Stellung abgesehen, unterscheiden sich die Fremdvölkersprüche in den beiden Versionen auch sonst. Wir wollen hier vor allem die Anordnung dieser Sprüche in MT und G untersuchen und sie dann vergleichen.

(51) BOGAERT, "L'Organisation", 148–150.

## 1. Die Darstellung von MT (Jer 46–51)

- 46,1 Was erging als Wort Jahwes an Jeremia den Propheten  
über die Völker — Ägypten
- 46,13 Das Wort, welches Jahwe sprach — Ägypten
- 47,1 Was erging als Wort Jahwes an Jeremia den Propheten  
über die Philister
- 48,47 Schicksalswende für Moab + “bis hierher”
- 49,6 Schicksalswende für Ammon
- 49,34 Was erging als Wort Jahwes an Jeremia den Propheten  
über Elam
- 49,39 Schicksalswende für Elam
- — — — —
- 50,1 Das Wort, welches Jahwe sprach — Babel
- 51,64 + “bis hierher”

Jer 46,1 beginnt mit einer allgemeinen Überschrift “Was erging (als) Wort Jahwes an Jeremia den Propheten über die Völker”, die im nächsten Vers auf “über Ägypten” präzisiert wird und mit diesem zusammen den Spruch gegen Ägypten einleitet. In dieser Form mit vorangestelltem Relativpronomen findet sich die Überschrift noch zweimal in unserer Sektion, nämlich in 47,1, wo statt ‘über die Völker’ ‘über die Philister’ steht und damit die Gerichtsansage gegen das zweite Volk eingeleitet wird, und in 49,34, mit ‘über Elam’ statt ‘über die Völker’, als Einleitung des letzten Spruches vor dem Gericht an Babel in Jer 50–51.

Innerhalb der sich an Ägypten richtenden Sprüche erfolgt eine erneute Einleitung in 46,13 mit “das Wort, das Jahwe sprach...”. Dieselbe Formel findet sich noch einmal in 50,1 am Beginn der Sprüche gegen Babel<sup>(52)</sup>. Alle anderen Fremdvölkersprüche in MT sind durch → ‘über/gegen’ + Name des Volkes eingeleitet, mit der einzigen Ausnahme von 51,1, dem zweiten Teil der Sprüche gegen Babel, der mit der Botenformel beginnt.

Ähnlich wie bei den Überschriften fallen auch bei den Endungen Gemeinsamkeiten auf. Die stärkste ist die Schicksalswende, die drei Völkern zugesagt wird, Moab in 48,47, den Ammonitern 49,6 und schließlich Elam 49,39. Immer ist die Zusage der Wende ihres Geschicks verbunden mit der Wurzel אחר ‘danach, Ende’ und der

(52) In 46,13 wird der Zeitpunkt und Jeremia als Empfänger des Wortes noch stärker herausgestrichen, in 50,1 dagegen die Adressaten (Babel und das Land der Chaldäer) und Jeremia als Vermittler.

Gottesspruchformel zum Schluß<sup>(53)</sup>. Verbunden mit dem ersten Vorkommen dieser Endung zeigt sich eine zweite Abschlußformel, beginnend mit 'bis hierher'. Sie steht in 48,47, am Ende des ersten nicht durch eine längere Überschrift eingeleiteten Spruches, und noch einmal in 51,64, am Schluß der ganzen Sektion.

Wenn wir alle diese Beobachtungen zusammennehmen, so ergibt sich ein System, bei dem durch drei jeweils gleichbleibende Überschriften und Endungen die Sprüche in Jer 46–49 zusammengehalten werden: Die ersten beiden Völker (Ägypten in 46,1 und die Philister in 47,1) haben dieselbe Überschrift, die nächsten beiden Völker (Moab in 48,47 und die Ammoniter in 49,6) eine ähnliche Endung. Beim letzten Volk (Elam 49,34.39) kommt beides mit Überschrift und Endung zum Abschluß. In dieses Schema, das Jer 46–49 als eigenen Block zusammenbindet, fügt sich, nicht ganz so stark, eine zweite Struktur ein, die die Sprüche gegen Babel in Jer 50–51 durch den 46,13 ähnlichen Beginn (in 50,1) und durch das 48,47b ähnliche Ende (in 51,64) an diesen ersten Block der Fremdvölkersprüche anschließt.

MT reiht die Völker wie folgt: Ägypten (zweimal) – Philister – Moab – Ammoniter – Edom – Damaskus – Kedar (+ Hazor) – Elam – Babel (zweimal). Die Stellung Ägyptens am ersten Platz schließt über das Trostwort für Baruch (Jer 45) hinweg an Jer 44 an (Worte Jeremias für die Judäer in Ägypten). Von dort geht die Bewegung auf Palästina zu, nennt Judas westliche (Philister), östliche (Moab, Ammoniter) und südöstliche (Edom) Nachbarn, und greift dann in einer weiten Bewegung nach Nordosten und Osten bis jenseits von Mesopotamien (Elam) aus. Babel am Ende bedeutet einen Schritt zurück, wieder in Richtung Ausgangspunkt dieser Bewegung. Die hier genannte Reihenfolge der Völker entspricht in etwa der von Jer 25 in der Bechervision<sup>(54)</sup>.

<sup>(53)</sup> Diese Zusage der Schicksalswende unterscheidet sich von der Verheißung an Ägypten im letzten Satz von 46,26.

P. HÖFFKEN, "Zu den Heilszusätzen in der Völkerorakelsammlung des Jeremiabuches. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Frage nach den Überlieferungsinteressen an den Völkerorakelsammlungen der Prophetenbücher", *VT* 27 (1977) 398–412, arbeitet heraus, daß in diesen Zusagen Konzeptionen des Heilsbereichs sichtbar werden, die je unterschiedlich sind nach MT und G. In G erhält nur Elam (siehe dazu die Korrektur von BOGAERT, "L'Organisation", 152, Anm. 19) solches Heil versprochen.

<sup>(54)</sup> RUDOLPH, *Jeremia*, 165–166; JANZEN, *Studies*, 115–116. Doch erwähnt Jer 25 weit mehr Völker und Orte; auch ist z.B. die Stellung Edoms (vor Moab) verschieden.

Versucht man, hinter dieser Reihenfolge eine Logik zu entdecken, so fallen zwei Gesichtspunkte auf. Einmal zeigt sich eine Bewegung von der Nähe in die Ferne. Es beginnt bei Ägypten, fast ein Nachbarland Israels, nennt dann die Länder ringsum, und endet mit weit entfernten Gebieten. Eventuell sind dabei, gerade durch die Stellung zu Beginn und durch die um Israel kreisende Bewegung, die Nachbarn<sup>(55)</sup> hervorgehoben. Zum zweiten bringt die Stellung Babels am Ende und die lange Ausgestaltung dieser Sprüche die Dramatik dort an ihren Höhepunkt. Im ausführlichen Gericht an Babel vollzieht sich exemplarisch und zusammenfassend Jahwes Gericht an den Völkern.

## 2. Die Darstellung von G (Jer 25–32)

Wie schon oben bei der Untersuchung von MT geht es auch hier vor allem um die Überschriften und Endungen sowie um die Reihenfolge der Fremdvölker.

Nach der allgemeinen, doch Elam schon nennenden Einleitung 25,14 (siehe unter II,1) setzt die Botenspruchformel *Táδε λέγει κύριος* "Dies spricht der Herr" in v. 15 den Spruch über Elam fort. Dieselbe Formel findet sich noch dreimal am Eingang von Völkerworten, und zwar in 28,1 (Beginn der zweiten Serie von Sprüchen gegen Babel), in 29,2 gegen die Fremdstämmigen<sup>(56)</sup> und 29,8 gegen Idumäa. Die ihr nahekommende Formel *Οὕτως εἶπεν κύριος* "So hat der Herr gesprochen" wird dreimal am Anfang verwendet, nämlich in 30,1 bei den Ammonitern, in 30,6 bei Kedar und in 31,1 bei Moab. Diese Einleitungen stehen jeweils an zweiter Stelle, nach der Erwähnung des Volkes, um das es sich handelt<sup>(57)</sup>. Die verschiedene Wiedergabe der hebräischen Botenformel *כה אמר יהוה* "so spricht Jahwe" ist u.a. ein Anzeichen für zwei Übersetzer bei der griechi-

<sup>(55)</sup> Mit Ausnahme der letzten beiden Völker sind alle in Jer 46–49 genannten zu einer Zeit Nachbarvölker Israels gewesen. Nach A. ROFÉ, "The Arrangement of the Book of Jeremiah", *ZAW* 101 (1989) 390–398, besonders 392, ist die Ordnung der Fremdvölker weniger geographisch als vielmehr durch die zwei beherrschenden Mächte (Ägypten und Babel) an Anfang und Ende bestimmt, denen jeweils die Nachbarn zugefügt werden. Doch auch die Vorstellung 'Nachbar' entspringt geographischer Betrachtungsweise.

<sup>(56)</sup> Traditionelle Übersetzung von G für die Philister.

<sup>(57)</sup> Ausnahme ist 28,1, wo aber bereits zuvor von Babel die Rede war.

schen Ausgabe von Jeremia<sup>(58)</sup>. Es ergibt sich so ein erster Block (25,14–29,23), bei dem nur die Ägyptensprüche und das erste Wort gegen Babel nicht mit “dies spricht der Herr” eingeleitet sind, und ein zweiter Block, bei dem die Formel “so hat der Herr gesprochen” nur bei Damaskus fehlt.

Die eigenartige Überschrift von MT “Was erging (als) Wort Jahwes an Jeremia den Propheten” findet sich bei G innerhalb der Völkerworte nie. Wir sahen bereits, daß bei ihr 25,13 und 32,13 der Funktion dieser Einleitung als Überschrift annähernd entsprechen. Dafür gibt es Spuren des anderen Überschriftensystems “das Wort, das Jahwe sprach”: In G kommen diese Worte nacheinander, in 26,13 als Einleitung zum zweiten Teil der Ägyptensprüche und in 27,1 am Beginn der Worte über Babel. Diese beiden Stellen sind weiter miteinander verbunden durch die gleiche Fortführung “verkündet...!”, aber keine von ihnen entspricht genau dem Hebräischen, und sie differieren auch untereinander. An letzterer Stelle fehlt in G, ähnlich wie schon in 25,12 “das Land der Chaldäer” und dazu auch noch “durch den Propheten Jeremia”<sup>(59)</sup>.

Die allgemeine Einleitung 25,14 ist zugleich auch an Elam gerichtet. MT, bei dem der Elamspruch an letzter Stelle steht (49,34–39), bringt in v. 34 eine Einleitung dazu und eine Datierung. In G finden wir beides wieder, aber am Ende (25,20) und in umgekehrter Reihenfolge. Die hier am Ende stehende Datierung ist außergewöhnlich, auch für G. Selbst im weiteren Zusammenhang stehen solche Datierungen immer am Beginn neuer Stücke: G Jer 21,1; 25,1; 26,13; 33,1; 35,1; usw. In Verbindung mit dem glatten Übergang in G bei Jer 25,12–15 wird eine solche Stellung am Ende verständlich: Die Datierung am Anfang des Elamspruches hätte den fließenden Übergang gestört.

<sup>(58)</sup> Statt mit zwei Übersetzern rechnet E. Tov, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch* (Missoula 1976) mit einer Revision von G Jer 29–52. Kritisch äußert sich dazu u.a. S. SODERLUND, *The Greek Text of Jeremiah. A Revised Hypothesis* (JSOTSS 47; Sheffield 1985) 153–192. — Aufgrund des Wechsels in der Botenformel hatte schon J. Thackeray 1902 mit mehreren Übersetzern gerechnet.

<sup>(59)</sup> Die größte Differenz zwischen MT und G besteht bei den Einleitungen zum Wort gegen die Philister. Doch ab dort, und d.h. bei den letzten fünf Völkerworten in G (29,8–31,1), entsprechen einander die knappen Einleitungen. Eine Ausnahme ist das Fehlen von Hazor in 30,6, wohl aufgrund anderer Lesung.



Wie steht es um die Endungen, vor allem um die Zusage, daß das Schicksal mancher Völker gewendet wird? Ein einziges Mal finden wir einen solchen 'Heilszusatz' <sup>(60)</sup> und zwar gleich beim ersten Spruch gegen Elam in 25,19. Weder Moab (bei dem am Ende gegenüber MT noch mehr fehlt, darunter auch das 'bis hierher') <sup>(61)</sup> noch die Ammoniter erhalten solche Zusagen, und auch der für Ägypten hoffnungsvolle Vers 46,26 (MT) fehlt in Jer 26 G. Dafür findet sich dort als 26,27-28 eine Dublette von MT (30,10-11 entspricht großteils 46,27-28), die Jakob = Israel Hoffnung gibt. — Wir wollen festhalten, daß die Darstellung der G den Völkern weniger Heil zuspricht als MT und daß G mit dem Gericht an den Völkern beginnt, während MT in der von ihm durchgehaltene Zweistufigkeit zuerst vom Gericht über Juda und Jerusalem spricht. MT ist also in diesen beiden Punkten den Völkern gegenüber positiver und zu sich selber kritischer eingestellt als G.

Auch die Reihenfolge von G unterscheidet sich gegenüber MT: Elam – Ägypten (zweimal) – Babel (zweimal) – Fremde (Philister) – Idumäa – Ammoniter – Kedar – Damaskus – Moab. Bei dieser Anordnung stehen — abgesehen von Elam, das aber wohl Übergangsfunktion hat — die großen Nationen (Ägypten und Babel) zuerst, dann kommen die Nachbarn Israels, bei denen zuerst die traditionellen Feinde, die 'Fremden' par excellence (Philister), dann das mit dem 'Edom' des MT sprachlich verbundene, vom Gebiet her aber nicht deckungsgleiche Idumäa <sup>(62)</sup> und schließlich alle östlichen Nachbarn kommen. Die Völkerworte münden ein, noch unterstrichen durch die Wiederaufnahme der allgemeinen Einleitung in 32,13

<sup>(60)</sup> Siehe dazu vor allem HÖFFKEN, "Zu den Heilszusätzen", mit der Korrektur von BOGAERT, "L'Organisation", und Anm. 53 oben.

<sup>(61)</sup> B. GOSSE, "Jérémie xlv et la place du recueil d'oracles contre les nations dans le livre de Jérémie", VT 40 (1990) 145-151, vor allem 151, sieht im fehlenden 'bis hierher...' von G das den Fremdvölkersprüchen entsprechende Ende. Auch das andere 'bis hierher' von MT, am Ende der Sprüche gegen Babel (51,64), ist in G nicht zu finden. In 28,64 wäre es natürlich deplaziert.

<sup>(62)</sup> *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* II, 800: Das Gebiet Idumäas umfaßt (ab dem 4.Jht.v.C.) das Gebiet südlich von Juda, und nicht, wie bei Edom, das Land südlich und südöstlich des Toten Meeres. Die Zuordnung von Teman und Dedan (29,8-9; Orte weit im Südosten in der Arabischen Wüste) zu 'Idumäa' spiegelt den hebräischen, nicht aber den griechischen Sprachgebrauch wieder.

und durch 'über alle Völker', in die Bechererzählung. Sie gibt ihnen einen bildhaften und dramatischen Abschluß<sup>(63)</sup>.

G präsentiert die bekannten, großen Völker zusammen und nimmt dafür dreimal ein geographisch weites Hin- und Herspringen in Ost-Westrichtung oder umgekehrt (Elam – Ägypten – Babel – Philister) in Kauf; in der Mitte stehen die zur Zeit der griechischen Übersetzung bestehenden, an Israel angrenzenden Gebiete Philistäas (29,5 Gaza und Aschkelon) und Idumäas, und am Ende stehen mit den alten Widersachern Israels nur noch Namen, denen zum Zeitpunkt des Übersetzens keine staatlichen Gebilde mehr entsprechen.

### 3. Vergleich

Bei den Fremdvölkersprüchen gäbe es noch weitere Unterschiede, auf die hier nicht eingegangen werden kann<sup>(64)</sup>. Doch läßt sich nach dem Bisherigen mindestens folgendes sagen: MT bringt die Völker geographisch geordnet; in einer großen Bewegung von Südwest nach Nordost werden alle Nationen erfaßt — mit zwei kleineren Abweichungen, nämlich Edom nach den Ammonitern und Elam vor Babel. Das Schwergewicht kommt auf Babel und das Land der Chaldäer zu liegen, die Sprüche gegen es nehmen auch den breitesten Raum ein. Die einzelnen Sprüche sind durch ein doppeltes Überschriften- und Endungensystem zusammengehalten. Die Stellung dieser Sprüche nach Jer 26–45 läßt in ihnen den zweiten Teil des in Jer 25 angekündigten Gerichts sehen. Nach dem Untergang Jerusalems vollzieht Jahwe das Gericht an den Völkern. Doch auch für einige von ihnen besteht Hoffnung (Ägypten, Moab, Ammoniter, Elam).

G dagegen sieht — mit Ausnahme von Elam — für die anderen Völker keine Aussicht auf Heil und läßt Gott das Gericht an ihnen gleich im Anschluß an die allgemeine Ansage in Jer 25 weiter ausführen. Der Spruch über Elam schafft dabei den eleganten Übergang. Das Endungensystem ist nicht vorhanden, vom doppelten Überschriftensystem sind nur noch Spuren zu entdecken (am Ende

<sup>(63)</sup> Doch selbst MCKANE, *Jeremiah I*, 644, sieht in 32,15-26\* eher eine vorausgehende Inhaltsangabe (wie es der Stellung von MT entspräche, wenn es dort nicht so weit von den Fremdvölkersprüchen getrennt wäre) als einen zusammenfassenden Abschluß (wie in G).

<sup>(64)</sup> Z.B. wird der Untergang Thebens nur in MT (46,25-26) berichtet, ebenso die Wegführung der Moabiter in Gefangenschaft (48,45-47), u.a.

in 25,20, wo die Datierung zum Schluß auffällig ist, und 26,13 mit 27,1). Dafür ergeben sich durch die unterschiedliche Übersetzung der eingangs verwendeten Botenformel zwei Blöcke. Der erste, von 25,14 bis 29,23, nennt nach Elam ehemalige politisch bedeutende Mächte und zwei Anrainergebiete Israels zur Zeit der Übersetzung ins Griechische, der zweite, in Jer 30–31, die unbedeutend gewordenen östlichen Nachbarn.

Aus diesem Vergleich allein ist nicht zu entscheiden, ob G oder MT Priorität zukommt. Doch Übergang und Ende des Elamspruchs, stärkere Ausrichtung auf Israels Heil, der direkte Anschluß der Völkerworte an Gottes Gerichtsansage Jer 25 und die nach Wichtigkeit geordneten Völker bei der griechischen Version sind Elemente, die leichter als neuordnende bzw. interpretierende Absicht von G angesehen werden können als umgekehrt MT zuzuschreiben, er habe eine ursprünglich bestehende direkte Beziehung zwischen 25,1–14 und Jer 46–49(–51) getrennt, Heil für manche Völker ergänzt und die Völker geographisch, aber doch auch wieder nicht ganz konsequent, neu arrangiert. Zusammen mit den eigenartigen Überschriften Jer G 25,14 und 32,13, die als Verdoppelung von Jer MT 25,13d anzusehen sind, neigt sich das Pendel noch mehr zugunsten von MT.

#### IV. Abwägen der Ergebnisse

Unsere Untersuchung von Jer 25 und zu den Fremdvölkersprüchen hat bisher folgendes ergeben: MT bietet einen Text, der sowohl in Details Spannungen aufweist (z.B. die drei Bestimmungen des Strafumsangs in Jer 25,13) als auch im Gesamtaufbau (z.B. der weite Abstand zwischen Bechererzählung und Beginn der Völkerworte) nicht leicht durchsichtig ist. Darin spiegelt sich die verschiedene Herkunft des Textmaterials sowie die längere Entstehungsgeschichte des Jeremiabuches mit ihren Redaktionen. Die Verschiedenheiten werden offenbar — wenigstens zum Teil<sup>(65)</sup> — belassen. So wird das Gericht am Land der Chaldäer gleichzeitig zur Vollstreckung des über alle Völker geweissagten Unheils. Auch bewirkt das erste Überschriften- und Endungensystem mit dem Elamspruch einen Abschluß, die Sprüche gegen Babel werden auf andere Weise, mit Hilfe eines zweiten Systems, zugefügt, ohne daß der Versuch gemacht wird, diese Systeme gleichzuschalten.

<sup>(65)</sup> Es kann nie mit Sicherheit gesagt werden, ob eine Redaktion nicht noch stärkere Spannungen in von ihr verwendeten Texten beseitigt hat.

Inhaltlich zeigt sich bei MT die Konzeption eines doppelten Gerichts, das zuerst Juda und dann die Völker trifft. Diese Konzeption wird dreimal durchgeführt: in Ankündigung Jer 25,(1-)8-14, in der Bechererzählung 25,15-38 und im Gericht<sup>(66)</sup> Jer 26-51. Auch die Anordnung der Völker weist mit ihrer geographischen Abfolge auf planvolle Gestaltung hin; im Gericht an Babel kommt Jahwes Gerechtigkeit schaffendes Eingreifen zum Höhepunkt und zum Abschluß<sup>(67)</sup>. Von daher kann auch die Schuld anderer Völker als geringer angesehen und ihnen, ähnlich wie Israel, Heil zugesprochen werden.

Der Text von G ist, auf den ersten Blick, leichter lesbar und kürzer. Statt der Brüche<sup>(68)</sup> von MT (Jer 25 auf 26 und 45 auf 46) fließt bei G die Ansage des Gerichtes Jahwes von Juda über ein unbestimmt bleibendes fremdes Land auf Elam und die anderen Völker über. Diese Völker kommen in der Reihenfolge ihrer Wichtigkeit in zwei Blöcken, von denen der erste (25,14-29,23) nochmals in Großmächte und kleinere Gebiete unterteilbar ist. Die meist kurzen Einleitungen ('über/für' + Name des fremden Volkes) stehen in der Regel vor der Botenformel, deren verschiedene Übersetzung die Einteilung in zwei Blöcke unterstreicht.

Doch fordern glatter Übergang und knapper Ausdruck ihren Tribut: 'Über jenes Land' von 25,13 bezieht sich über den Ausdruck und den vorhergehenden Zusammenhang auf Juda, von Sinn und nachfolgendem Kontext her aber auf ein anderes Land. Die Formulierung "die Völker Elams" in 25,14 erscheint wie eine Mischung von allgemeiner und spezieller Einleitung; die Datierung dieses Spruchs erfolgt — ganz unüblich — am Ende in 25,20. Die allgemeine Einleitung steht noch ein zweites Mal in 32,13 vor der Bechererzählung. Es ist die Entsprechungstelle zu MT, doch durch das

<sup>(66)</sup> Auch wenn dabei am Unterschied festzuhalten ist, daß die meisten Völkerworte dieses Gericht als in Zukunft eintreffend darstellen, während der Untergang Judas und Jerusalems als Gegenwart bzw. Vergangenheit geschildert wird.

<sup>(67)</sup> Diese Sonderstellung Babels kommt im hebräischen Text von 25,9-12,26 entsprechend zum Ausdruck.

<sup>(68)</sup> Brüche können aber auch Übergänge sein: C. R. SEITZ, "The Prophet Moses and the Canonical Shape of Jeremiah", *ZAW* 101 (1989) 3-27, besonders 18-27, hat auf die Verbindungen zwischen Jer 45 und den Fremdvölkersprüchen aufmerksam gemacht; er sieht darin eine Bestätigung für die Stellung von MT. — Siehe als Gegenposition dazu: GOSSE, "Jérémie xlv".

Fehlen eines vorausgehenden Redens Gottes (wie in MT Jer 25,13) wird in G Jeremias Weissagen dem Sprechen Gottes im unmittelbar folgenden v. 15 vorgeordnet.

Der stärkste inhaltliche Unterschied gegenüber MT ist die veränderte Ansage von Heil bzw. Unheil in G. Vor allem Babel und das Land der Chaldäer sind durch mehrmaliges Fehlen der entsprechenden Benennungen und durch die Stellung innerhalb der Völkerworte deutlich weniger betont als in MT<sup>(69)</sup>. Die Gerichtsansage an Juda wird in dieser Sektion von G nur kurz gestreift (25,8-11); Aussicht auf Heil wird als einzigem fremden Volk Elam zuteil.

Was die in der bisherigen wissenschaftlichen Diskussion angeführten Argumente für eine Priorität von G betrifft, sahen wir, daß sie sich entweder umkehren lassen oder das zu Beweisende voraussetzen. So muß neu, unvoreingenommen, bezüglich der Stellung und Anordnung der Völkersprüche gefragt werden: Ist es wahrscheinlicher, daß MT sich aus G (bzw. dessen Vorlage) entwickelt hat, oder umgekehrt?

Zur Beantwortung dieser Frage stehen einander gegenüber: ein Spannungen enthaltender, aber nicht unverständlicher Text bei MT, gegen den glatter verlaufenden, aber darin auch Probleme aufwerfenden Text bei G; ein menschliches, Gott teils fast grausam zeichnendes Reden in der Bechererzählung, gegen ein milderes, weniger Strafe enthaltendes Gottesbild; ein konsequenter, durch seinen Umfang (Jer 25–51) komplexer Aufbau<sup>(70)</sup>, gegen die logischere, weniger Brüche enthaltende und mit den anderen Prophetenbüchern übereinstimmende Komposition; ein durch je doppeltes Überschriften- und Endungensystem kunstvoll zusammengefügter Block der Völkerworte, gegen ihre eher nüchtern eingeleitete und nach Wichtigkeit gereichte Anordnung; eine auch andere Völker stärker mit Heil bedenkende Haltung<sup>(71)</sup> gegen eine mehr Israels Heil betonende Ausrichtung. Ist der komplexere, schwierigere, anderen gegen-

<sup>(69)</sup> Auch sonst fehlen einige Städte: Theben 46,25; Heschbon 48,45; Hazor 49,28. Die in MT in reicherm Maße vorhandenen Identifizierungen sprechen gegen LABERGE, "Jérémie 25,1-14", 62, der meint, MT verallgemeinere.

<sup>(70)</sup> Jer 25 MT ist zugleich Abschluß für die erste Sektion (Jer 1–24) und Überleitung/Ankündigung für die zweite und dritte Sektion (Jer 25–45 und 46–51 + 52).

<sup>(71)</sup> Dazu gehören auch die Identifizierungen sowie das Erwähnen weiterer Städte/Völker mit Namen.

über offenere Text der ursprüngliche, oder der glattere, logischere, der mehr auf das eigene Heil schaut?

Vor allem das je doppelte Überschriften- und Endungensystem scheint mir dagegen zu sprechen, daß MT aus einer G ähnlichen hebräischen Vorlage erweitert oder verändert wurde. Wäre MT aus der in G vorliegenden Anordnung der Sprüche entstanden, so hätte ein Redaktor bei der neuen Anordnung wohl nur ein Überschriften- und Endungensystem verwendet. Die je doppelten Systeme sind doch mit hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit als Zeichen sukzessiven Wachstums zu deuten. Da eine Neuordnung der Völkerworte kaum in zwei Etappen erfolgte, haben wir eher damit zu rechnen, daß G bei der durch die Übersetzung ohnehin möglich gewordenen neuen Reihung die nun nicht mehr passenden und auch nicht notwendigen Überschriften- und Endungensysteme weggelassen bzw. verändert hat. — Ein solcher freier Umgang von G mit der hebräischen Vorlage innerhalb der Sektion der Völkerworte wird noch bestätigt durch den Vergleich bei der Bechererzählung (siehe oben unter II,2): G zeigt dabei Tendenzen und Eigenarten in der Übersetzung, die als im Zuge einer Übersetzung entstandene Verschiebungen gegenüber dem Original erklärbar sind.

Der Befund unserer Untersuchung von Jer 25 und den Fremdvölkersprüchen gibt MT Priorität gegenüber G sowohl was die Stellung im Jeremiabuch wie auch die Reihenfolge der Sprüche betrifft. Wenn — mit aller Vorsicht — die vermutlichen Entwicklungsstufen skizziert werden dürfen, dann in dieser Weise: An Jer 1–45 wird die in sich selbst zwei Redaktionsstufen enthaltende Sammlung Jer 46–51 angeschlossen<sup>(72)</sup>, an sie wird später Jer 52 angefügt. Das so entstandene hebräische Jeremiabuch entspricht nicht dem Aufbau-schema der großen Propheten<sup>(73)</sup> und wird anlässlich der griechischen Übersetzung nach diesem abgeändert. Dabei werden die Völkerworte an das in Jer 25 angekündigte Gottesgericht angeschlossen, was die in MT weit von der Bechererzählung entfernt stehenden Sprüche gegen die fremden Völker zusammenbringt und damit dessen zwei abrupte Themenwechsel (Jer 25 zu 26 und 45 zu 46) besei-

<sup>(72)</sup> Eine in einem zweiten Schritt erfolgende Zufügung von Jer 50–51 (an Jer 1–49) ist zwar nicht auszuschließen, doch wegen der Bedeutung Babels und der Dramatik der Völkerworte meines Erachtens eher unwahrscheinlich.

<sup>(73)</sup> Und auch nicht, nach BOGAERT, "L'Organisation", 148–149, dem Zwölfprophetenbuch in der Anordnung von G.

tigt. Der Übergang wird durch einige Auslassungen und das Vorziehen des Elamspruches elegant vollzogen, die weiteren Völker nach Wichtigkeit geordnet. Die Überschriften und Endungen, nunmehr größtenteils sinnlos geworden, fallen bei dieser Umgestaltung ebenso weg wie die Zuspitzung auf das inzwischen unbedeutende Babel. Auch erlaubt das eigene schwere Schicksal in der Diaspora nicht mehr, die fremden Völker so stark mit Heil zu bedenken wie in MT oder sogar einen ihrer Herrscher im Mund Gottes mit 'mein Knecht' angeredet sein zu lassen. — Es ist verständlich, daß dieser so entstehende 'logischere, einfachere' Text von G heute manchen als der ursprünglichere erscheint. Meines Erachtens ist er es aber nicht.

Sillgasse 6  
A-6021 Innsbruck  
Österreich

Georg FISCHER, SJ

#### SOMMAIRE

Les différences entre le texte hébreu (TM) et grec (G) de Jérémie apparaissent surtout en Jr 25 et dans les oracles contre les nations que l'un et l'autre place à des endroits différents. Ces dernières années, J.G. Janzen et P.-M. Bogaert ont soutenu la priorité de G (ou de sa *Vorlage* hébraïque) et leur thèse est devenue *opinio communis*. Cependant, quelques indices parlent au contraire en faveur de la priorité du texte hébreu qui est à l'origine du TM. Pour le prouver, cet article analyse la transition de Jr 25,12-15, le récit de la coupe (TM: 25,15-38; G: 32,15-38) et la façon d'introduire ou conclure les oracles contre les nations (TM: 46-51; G: 25-31). En fait, il semble que les traducteurs grecs aient simplifié et clarifié un texte hébreu devenu complexe en raison d'un long processus rédactionnel.

## **Reform and Regression: The Chronicler's Presentation of Jehoshaphat**

The Chronicler's depiction of Jehoshaphat is intriguing. In stark contrast with the Deuteronomist's cursory coverage, the Chronicler devotes more space to Jehoshaphat than to any other king in the divided monarchy, except Hezekiah<sup>(1)</sup>. Why such extended attention? The appeal to the Chronicler's sources only partially addresses this question<sup>(2)</sup>. Assuming the existence of such sources, why does the Chronicler incorporate, order and shape them in the manner that he does? Why list the major incidents of Jehoshaphat's tenure in such a loose arrangement? Why does the Chronicler both write his own evaluation of Jehoshaphat (2 Chr 17,3-4) and incorporate the deuteronomistic evaluation of Jehoshaphat near the close of his reign (2 Chr 20,32-33), thereby maintaining that the high places were both destroyed and not destroyed?

Dillard's theory that the Chronicler patterns Jehoshaphat's reign after that of Asa is not compelling, because there are too many discrepancies between the two in organization, form and content<sup>(3)</sup>. Basing his views solely on those passages which reflect well on Jehoshaphat (2 Chr 17,1-17; 19,4-20,30), Mosis contends that the Chronicler is stressing the relationship between the community's seeking YHWH and striving toward righteous judgment and YHWH's strengthening and testing of the community<sup>(4)</sup>. Should one, however,

(<sup>1</sup>) The Chronicler's coverage of Jehoshaphat totals 101 verses, while his coverage of Hezekiah totals 117 verses.

(<sup>2</sup>) W. F. ALBRIGHT, "The Judicial Reform of Jehoshaphat", *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume* (ed. S. LIEBERMAN) (New York 1950) 74-82; J. M. MYERS, *II Chronicles* (AB 13; New York 1965) 99-117.

(<sup>3</sup>) R. DILLARD, *2 Chronicles* (WBC 15; Waco, TX 1987) 129-130. S. J. DE VRIES summarizes differences in sequence and content between the two reigns, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (FOTL XI; Grand Rapids 1989) 308-309.

(<sup>4</sup>) R. MOSIS, *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes* (Freiburger theologische Studien 91; Freiburg 1973) 175-178. Mosis thinks that 2 Chr 18,1-19,3 is not so much a reflection of the Chronicler's view toward Jehoshaphat as it is a warning to the Yahwistic



divorce these passages from those which are critical of Jehoshaphat's dealings with Israel (2 Chr 18,1–19,4a; 20,35–37) as the key to the Chronicler's purpose? Does this not evade the complexity of the Chronicler's presentation? Japhet queries, "the book presents a highly complimentary portrayal of Jehoshaphat. Why, then, did the Chronicler not delete the account of Jehoshaphat's connections with Israel?"<sup>(5)</sup> Williamson believes that the Chronicler writes to contrast the blessings of obedience with the dangers of association with the wicked<sup>(6)</sup>. But, considering the Chronicler's doctrine of retribution, is this contrast not valid for any reign in Chronicles? Is it possible to be more specific?

I believe that Jehoshaphat's alliances with Israel constitute an integral part of the Chronicler's narration. In fact, I argue that in his depiction of Jehoshaphat the Chronicler is commenting on the whole era which Jehoshaphat helps to inaugurate — rapprochement with the northern kingdom. The Chronicler associates Jehoshaphat with the familial entanglement between Omrides and Davidides, which the Deuteronomist only develops in his coverage of Ahab, Jehoram, Ahaziah and Athaliah. Although the Chronicler clearly disassociates Jehoshaphat from the sins of these monarchs, he charges him with instituting alliances which only work to the detriment of Judah, compromising its distinctive identity. I am not claiming that all the information the Chronicler imparts about Jehoshaphat is intended as a comment upon his relations with Israel. I do believe, however, that the Chronicler's concern for a sovereign Judah explains several cruxes in his exposition of Jehoshaphat's tenure. In my view, the Chronicler constructs Jehoshaphat's reign to underscore the merits of an independent Judah relying upon YHWH alone and the demerits of a dependent Judah encumbered by alliances.

---

community about associating with those whom YHWH hates (177). Given the Chronicler's editing of and commentary upon Jehoshaphat's actions in 2 Chr 18,1–19,4a and 20,35–37 (see below), I think that this argument is inherently flawed.

<sup>(5)</sup> S. JAPHET, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought* (Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des Antiken Judentums 9; Frankfurt am Main 1989) 314. W. RUDOLPH also expresses bewilderment at the inclusion of Jehoshaphat's treaty with Ahab, *Chronikbücher* (HAT 21; Tübingen 1955) 253.

<sup>(6)</sup> H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (NCBC; Grand Rapids 1982) 278.

*Jehoshaphat in Kings*

Although historians credit Jehoshaphat and Ahab with ushering in a whole new era of prosperity and stability in Judah and Israel, the deuteronomistic coverage of Jehoshaphat is both brief and enigmatic<sup>(7)</sup>. He devotes ten verses exclusively to Jehoshaphat (1 Kgs 22,41-51), but elsewhere includes two joint campaigns between Jehoshaphat and kings Ahab (1 Kgs 22,1-38) and Jehoram (2 Kgs 3,1-27). Since each of these campaigns is written with a view to events in the northern kingdom, the Deuteronomist incorporates these accounts in his discussion of these two northern monarchs<sup>(8)</sup>.

In the Deuteronomistic History Jehoshaphat is only one of eight kings whom the author rates positively, "he walked in all the way of his father Asa, not turning from it, doing what was right in the sight of YHWH" (1 Kgs 22,43)<sup>(9)</sup>. Jehoshaphat is also a reformer: he removes the cultic prostitutes remaining from the time of Asa's reforms (1 Kgs 22,47). This strong commendation notwithstanding, the Deuteronomist qualifies his praise for Jehoshaphat: "the high places were not removed; the people continued sacrificing and burning incense at the high places" (1 Kgs 22,44).

The Deuteronomist lists events in staccato fashion, noting that Jehoshaphat made peace with Ahab and that Edom had no king, but a regent (1 Kgs 22,45.48). Both the introductory and the concluding formulae appear anomalously in Jehoshaphat's reign. The introductory formulae are split between 1 Kgs 15,24 (accession) and

(7) J.M. MILLER—J.H. HAYES, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (Philadelphia 1986) 250-278. See also H.L. GINSBERG, "The Omrid-Davidid Alliance and its Consequences", *Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem 1967) II, 91.

(8) Although the kings of Israel are identified as Ahab and Jehoram respectively, and the king of Judah is identified as Jehoshaphat, many scholars believe that the monarchs were originally unnamed. See J.D. SHENKEL, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings* (HSM 1; Cambridge, MA 1968) 93-108 and E. WÜRTHWEIN, *Die Bücher der Könige: 1 Kön. 17-2 Kön. 25* (ATD 11/2; Göttingen 1984) 255-262, 279-282. Since the Chronicler used a text of Kings of a proto-Rabbinic text-type, he doubtless understood the two monarchs in the first story to be Ahab and Jehoshaphat. See further, S. MCKENZIE, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History* (HSM 33; Atlanta 1985) 101-102.

(9) Asa (1 Kgs 15,11), Jehoshaphat (1 Kgs 22,43), Joash (2 Kgs 12,3), Amaziah (2 Kgs 14,3), Azariah (2 Kgs 15,3), Jotham (2 Kgs 15,34), Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18,3) and Josiah (2 Kgs 22,2).

1 Kgs 22,41-42 (synchronism, length of reign, name of mother), while the concluding formulae are split between the middle of the Deuteronomist's description of Jehoshaphat's reign (1 Kgs 22,46-47) and the end of that description (1 Kgs 22,51)<sup>(10)</sup>. Aside from Jehoshaphat's ill-fated shipbuilding venture (see below), no other information is provided about his reign.

In reading the Deuteronomist's account, one is struck by the lack of commentary on, or evaluation of, Jehoshaphat's treaty with Ahab, his abortive shipbuilding venture, and his refusal of a maritime treaty with Ahaziah. Nor does the Deuteronomist integrate all this information into a more comprehensive summary on the significance of Jehoshaphat in Israelite history. This *modus operandi*, however, accords well with the stance the Deuteronomist takes toward the entire history of the divided kingdom. The Deuteronomist views the existence of both the northern and the southern kingdoms as legitimate entities ordained by God<sup>(11)</sup>. Consistent with this presentation, the Deuteronomist views the northern tribes' revolt at the assembly at Shechem as the fulfillment of prophecy (1 Kgs 12,15) and divinely ordained (1 Kgs 12,24). Because both Judah and Israel are divinely authorized, the Deuteronomist does not consider alliances between the two realms an issue. His concern, as is well known, centers on cultic matters: worship of other gods, support of the temple, and posture toward the high places. Hence, the Deuteronomist's treatment of Jehoshaphat is largely consistent with his treatment of other Judean kings.

### *Introduction to the Chronicler's Treatment of Jehoshaphat*

In contrast with the Deuteronomist, the Chronicler views the very existence of the northern kingdom as an affront against God. In his presentation of Solomon, Rehoboam and Abijah, the Chronicler declares both the cult and kingship of Jeroboam as rebellious and illegitimate from their inception<sup>(12)</sup>. Although the

<sup>(10)</sup> In contrast, the account of 3 Reigns 16,28a-b does have the introductory formulae in their right order.

<sup>(11)</sup> See my "Dynastic Oracle and Secession in 1 Kings 11", *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies* 7 (1987) 159-172.

<sup>(12)</sup> See my "Rehoboam in Chronicles: Villain or Victim?", *JBL* 109 (1990) 423-440 and the discussion of the Chronicler's treatment of the northern kingdom in JAPHET, *Ideology*, 308-324.

Northerners are still Israelites and, as such, an object of divine concern, the traditions and institutions of historic Israel find their continuation in Judah. Considering this perspective, it is not at all surprising that the Chronicler omits the independent history of the northern kingdom.

Given both the brevity of the deuteronomistic presentation and the Chronicler's omission of the entire history of the northern kingdom (thereby truncating his *Vorlage*), it is not surprising that the Chronicler fashions a more coherent and complete portrait of one of the most highly lauded kings in Judean history. The Chronicler does not dispense with or correct, however, the anomalous order he finds in the concluding notices to Jehoshaphat's reign. Nor does he dispense with the Deuteronomist's evaluation of Jehoshaphat, even though it differs from his own. The Chronicler's methodology is, I would argue, more complex.

In his own distinctive presentation of Jehoshaphat, the Chronicler includes practically all the information from Kings, but he radically recasts it. First, the Chronicler posits a series of initial successes in Jehoshaphat's reign, unmentioned in Kings (2 Chr 17,1-19). Second, he reworks, reorders and evaluates events listed in his *Vorlage*. Third, he contributes so much new material that his presentation dwarfs that of the Deuteronomist. Fourth, the Chronicler organizes his depiction of Jehoshaphat's tenure as a series of incidents with only brief transitions. In my judgment, the Chronicler's portrait of Jehoshaphat is therefore an excellent example of paratactic composition<sup>(13)</sup>. Finally, in recasting Jehoshaphat's reign, the Chronicler effectively restructures not only the reign of Jehoshaphat, but also, I would argue, the entire epoch which Jehoshaphat helps to inaugurate.

### I. Consolidation, Commendation and Success (17,1-19)

Deferring almost all of the deuteronomistic introductory notices pertaining to Jehoshaphat to late in his reign, the Chronicler

<sup>(13)</sup> In parataxis the primary principle of organization is neither chronological nor dramatic (rising toward a climax). On parataxis in biblical narrative, see the classic treatment of E. AUERBACH, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (Garden City, NY 1957) 1-20, 61-66, and more recently J. VAN SETERS, *In Search of History* (New Haven 1983) 31-40.

depicts Jehoshaphat, upon taking office, immediately taking charge of his kingdom. As he institutes reforms, deploys troops and fortifies cities Jehoshaphat only grows stronger and more widely respected. Williamson's insight that "the very generalised introductory vv. 1-6 are amplified in the following paragraphs" can be developed and refined by means of a close analysis of this pericope<sup>(14)</sup>. In my judgment, there are four complementary schemas in 2 Chr 17,1-19, which the Chronicler organizes as an elaborate chiasm.

a	Fortifications and Army	17,1-2
b	Commendation	17,3-4
c	Tribute and Respect	17,5
d	Reform	17,6
d <sup>1</sup>	Further Reforms	17,7-9
c <sup>1</sup>	International Tribute and Respect	17,10-11
b <sup>1</sup>	Increasing Greatness	17,12a
a <sup>1</sup>	Fortifications and Army	17,12b-19

a. *Fortifications and Army* 17,1-2

Given that Judah suffered an invasion from Baasha of Israel during the reign of Asa, his predecessor (2 Chr 16,1-6), Jehoshaphat significantly begins his reign by "consolidating his rule against Israel" (2 Chr 17,1)<sup>(15)</sup>. He accomplishes this feat by placing warriors in all the fortified cities of Judah and by stationing prefects "in the land of Judah and in the cities of Ephraim, which his father Asa had captured" (2 Chr 17,1-2). Continuing the policies of Abijah (2 Chr 13,19) and Asa (2 Chr 15,8), who captured portions of the northern kingdom, Jehoshaphat safeguards the territorial gains made by Asa at the expense of Israel from any possible intrusion.

<sup>(14)</sup> WILLIAMSON, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 280. Both W. RUDOLPH, *Chronik-bücher* (HAT 21; Tübingen 1955) 249-252 and Williamson argue that the Chronicler composes vv. 1-19 using older sources. MOSIS, *Untersuchungen*, 177, is dubious.

<sup>(15)</sup> The expression *hthzq 'l ysr'l* can be translated either as "consolidated one's rule over" (e.g. 2 Chr 1,1) or consolidated one's rule against", but the context favors the latter translation. The last part of Asa's reign witnessed an invasion from Baasha of Israel extending to Ramah, which threatened to embargo Judah (2 Chr 16,1-6). Moreover, the notice in 2 Chr 17,2 that Jehoshaphat stationed troops in the cities of Judah and Ephraim (under his control) evinces a concern to strengthen Judah's defenses over against traditionally hostile Israel (2 Chr 12,15; 13,2-20; 16,1-6).

b. *Commendation 17,3-4*

Jehoshaphat's conduct in domestic affairs also sets him apart from the policies of his northern counterparts. The Chronicler's evaluation of Jehoshaphat explicitly refers to the northern kingdom. In so doing, the Chronicler seems to be drawing upon the deuteronomistic evaluations not only of Jehoshaphat, but also of Jehoram and Ahaziah.

2 Chr 17,3: *wayhî YHWH 'im-yěhōšāpāt kî hālak bēdarkê* <sup>(16)</sup> *'ābîw hāri'sōnîm wēlō' dāraš labbē 'ālîm.*

2 Chr 17,4: *kî lē'lōhē 'ābîw dārāš ūbēmîšōtāyw* <sup>(17)</sup> *hālak wēlō' kēma 'āšēh yiśrā' ēl.*

2 Kgs 8,18: *wayyēlek bēderek malkē yiśrā' ēl ka' āšer 'āsû bêt 'ah' āb kî bat-'ah' āb* <sup>(18)</sup> *hāyetâ-lô lē'iššā wayya'as hāra' bē'ēnē YHWH.*

2 Kgs 8,27: *wayyēlek bēderek bêt 'ah' āb wayya'as hāra' bē'ēnē YHWH kēbêt 'ah' āb* <sup>(19)</sup>.

Whereas in Kings Jehoram and Ahaziah are the first southern monarchs whom the Deuteronomist compares with royal practices in the northern kingdom, Jehoshaphat is the first in Chronicles. Inasmuch as Baal worship has not been mentioned in Chronicles, the Chronicler's assertion that Jehoshaphat "did not seek the Baals" is also significant<sup>(20)</sup>. In Kings Ahab and Jezebel formally introduce and provide state sanction to Baal worship in Samaria (1 Kgs 16,31-32). Since Baal worship spreads to the southern realm

<sup>(16)</sup> The MT reads *dywd*, but the LXX<sup>AB</sup> lack the term. The name of David is also lacking in 1 Kgs 22,43. Since in Chronicles David does not manifest former or latter ways, we read 's' *byw* with the LXX<sup>AB</sup>.

<sup>(17)</sup> Reading with the MT and *be*<sub>2</sub>, Theodotion and Lucian. The LXX<sup>AB</sup> expand to *kai en tais entolais tou patros autou*.

<sup>(18)</sup> Instead of *bt-'h'b*, the Syriac has *hth* (= *'hwt 'h'b*). Whichever is the earlier reading, the Chronicler's *Vorlage* seems to have read *bt-'h'b* (2 Chr 18,1).

<sup>(19)</sup> The MT of 2 Kgs 8,27 continues with the reading: *ky htn byt 'h'b hw'* "because he was related to the house of Ahab". This reading finds support in the LXX<sup>Aiuxz</sup>, and the Syriac *gambros gar oikou Achaab estin*, *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> hoti gambros oikou Achaab estin*, and the Armenian *quia gener erat domus Achaab*. However it is *sub asterisco* in *e*<sub>2</sub> and the Syro-hexaplar and is not found in 2 Chr 22,4. The reading may have arisen as an explication modelled on 2 Kgs 8,18.

<sup>(20)</sup> Baal appears as a proper name in 1 Chr 5,5; 8,30 and 9,36, but the Chronicler only introduces the whole question of worshipping the Baals in Jehoshaphat's reign (cf. 2 Chr 24,7; 28,2; 33,3; 34,4).

through the auspices of their daughter, Athaliah, who becomes the wife of Jehoram, the mother of Ahaziah, and head of state in her own right, it is understandable that the Deuteronomist condemns these monarchs.

In comparing the policies of Jehoshaphat with northern policies, the Chronicler distinguishes the former from the latter. That the Chronicler also wishes to distinguish between the practices of Jehoshaphat and his successors is clear from Elijah's letter to Jehoram (2 Chr 21,12b-13a) and the burial notice for Ahaziah (2 Chr 22,9). Hence, the Chronicler, initially at least, sets Jehoshaphat apart from the subsequent period of cultic contamination. Correlative to his lauding Jehoshaphat for not imitating the practices of Israel, the Chronicler also praises Jehoshaphat for "seeking the God of his fathers" and for "following his commandments" (17,4)<sup>(21)</sup>.

c. *Tribute and Respect 17,5*

Following his commendation of Jehoshaphat, the Chronicler portrays Jehoshaphat as enjoying triumphs typical of his nation's best monarchs. YHWH establishes Jehoshaphat's kingdom and this divine acclamation is echoed in the acclamation of his people. All of Judah brings tribute to the new king, who, like Solomon, experiences "riches and honor in abundance" (22).

d. *Reforms 17,6*

Experiencing the acclamation of God and his people, does not lead to haughtiness or hubris on the part of Jehoshaphat. On the contrary, "his mind was exalted in the ways of YHWH"<sup>(23)</sup>. This immersion in the ways of YHWH leads Jehoshaphat to institute cultic reforms, removing the high places and asherahs from Judah

(21) On the Chronicler's use of the stereotypical expressions "walking in YHWH's commandments" and "seeking YHWH", see JAPHET, *Ideology*, 200-201. The Chronicler uses most of the complimentary expressions Japhet discusses in his treatment of Jehoshaphat.

(22) Popular support, riches and tribute all belong to a repertoire of motifs in Chronicles indicating divine favor. See R. DILLARD, "Reward and Punishment in Chronicles: The Theology of Immediate Retribution", *WTJ* 46 (1984) 164-172.

(23) The expression *gbh lbw* normally connotes haughtiness (Ps 131,1; Prov 18,2; 2 Chr 26,16; 32,25; Ezek 28,2.5.17). The Chronicler plays on this meaning to compliment Jehoshaphat.

(17,6)<sup>(24)</sup>. These initial reforms are therefore primarily negative in nature, designed to remove heteropraxis from Judah.

d<sup>1</sup>. *Further Reforms 17,7-9*

The Chronicler introduces the second half of this initial tableau (17,7-19) with a brief chronological notice, "in the third year of his reign" (17,7). The Chronicler's portrayal of Jehoshaphat as a reformer is not limited to crediting him with the suppression of rival cults. Complementing Jehoshaphat's ridding Judah of heteropraxis is his encouragement of orthopraxis. Jehoshaphat initiates a campaign to educate the Judean people in "the scroll of the torah of YHWH" by sending officers, Levites and priests throughout the cities of Judah to teach torah. This concern to disseminate torah to the wider populace conforms to a deuteronomic ideal, but is implemented in a characteristically un-deuteronomic way<sup>(25)</sup>.

Although a number of biblical traditions depict the juridical responsibilities of monarchs (e.g., 2 Sam 8,15-18; 1 Kgs 3,16-28) or express the desire for royal justice (e.g., 1 Sam 8,5; Psalm 72), 2 Chronicles 17 is most unusual in its depiction of a king explicitly mandating the dissemination of torah. To speculate about the existence of an original royal law code or edict, in my judgment, misses the mark completely<sup>(26)</sup>. Although many such ancient Near Eastern law codes are associated with deities, they make no attempt

<sup>(24)</sup> J. Wellhausen points out that neither the claim that Jehoshaphat removed the high places (17,6) nor the claim that the people failed to do so (20,33) comports with the Chronicler's own presentation of history, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (Edinburgh 1885) 193. The Chronicler, unlike the Deuteronomist (1 Kgs 11,7-8; 12,31; 14,23), does not mention the introduction of high places either during the time of Solomon or the early divided kingdom. In my judgment, the Chronicler's handling of this issue is schematic (see below).

<sup>(25)</sup> The deuteronomic law of the king (Deut 17,14-20) stipulates that the king is to read the torah perpetually, but responsibility for the dissemination of torah is incumbent upon all in the community (e.g., Deuteronomy 6) and is not an explicitly royal prerogative.

<sup>(26)</sup> MYERS, *II Chronicles* 99-100. In contrast, R. North, S.J., ingeniously proposes that 17,7-9 is written with a view to a post-exilic Levite instructional mission, "The Chronicler: 1-2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah", *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (ed. R. E. BROWN, S.S., J. A. FITZMYER, S.J., and R. E. MURPHY, O.Carm.) (Englewood Cliffs, NJ 1990) 377.



to conceal royal promulgation. On the contrary, Hammurapi boasts that he "established law and justice in the language of the land" (27). The biblical sources, however, uniformly depict God as the author of law (28).

Set against the background of ancient Near Eastern legal tradition, 2 Chr 17,7-9 ingeniously presents a king promulgating not his own royal code, but God's law. The result is something unprecedented in Israelite history: a king mandating education in torah to his whole people. Both negative (17,6) and positive (17,7-9) royal initiatives therefore complement each other, signalling the new monarch's concerted efforts toward thorough reformation.

c<sup>1</sup>. *International Tribute and Respect 17,10-11*

Complementing domestic stability, tribute and wealth, are international tranquility, tribute and respect: "the fear of YHWH was upon all the kingdoms of the lands which surrounded Judah, and they did not go to war with Jehoshaphat" (17,10). Far from being hostile, some of Judah's neighbors send great tribute to Jehoshaphat. Certain Philistines send a load of silver, while the Arabs send Jehoshaphat 7,700 rams and 7,700 he-goats (17,11).

b<sup>1</sup>. *Increasing Greatness 17,12a*

Not only the list of Jehoshaphat's accomplishments, but also the Chronicler's own comments upon Jehoshaphat's deeds reinforce a picture of continuing improvement in his reign. Earlier the Chronicler praised Jehoshaphat for following YHWH's commandments and not seeking the Baals (17,3-4). Because of this fidelity, "YHWH was with him" (17,3). The Chronicler now heightens this praise of Jehoshaphat by declaring that "Jehoshaphat grew steadily greater" (v. 12).

a<sup>1</sup>. *Fortifications and Army 17,12b-19*

Upon taking office Jehoshaphat stationed troops and prefects in the cities of Judah and Ephraim under his control (17,1-2).

(27) ANET, 165.

(28) See M. GREENBERG, "Some Postulates of Biblical Criminal Law", *The Jewish Expression* (ed. J. GOLDIN) (New Haven-London 1976) 21-24 and K. WHITELAM, *The Just King: Monarchical Judicial Authority in Ancient Israel* (JSOTSS 12; Sheffield 1979) 209-218.

Continuing this military expansion, he now builds fortresses and store-cities in Judah (vv. 12-13a). The Chronicler concludes that he had "great work in the cities of Judah" (v. 13a). Complementing the troops at various locations in Judah is an impressive muster of "men of war, mighty warriors" from Judah and Benjamin in Jerusalem, totalling 1,160,000 men (vv. 13b-19). This tally does not include those troops stationed in the fortified cities of Judah (v. 19).

## II. Joint Expedition to Ramoth-gilead (18,1-19,4a)

Having sketched a most impressive start to Jehoshaphat's reign, the Chronicler then portrays Jehoshaphat embarking upon a major policy shift in his relations with the northern kingdom. Rather than pursuing the independent course which he himself implemented with great success, Jehoshaphat reverses course by establishing a covenant with the northern realm.

The Chronicler effects this narrative shift by incorporating the long account of Ahab and Jehoshaphat's war against Ramoth-gilead from 1 Kings 22 with few changes. Basically omitting the explication of Ahab's death (1 Kgs 22,36-38), the Chronicler frames the remaining episode by adding both an introduction and a conclusion. The two accounts can be outlined as follows.

Riches and Glory	————	2 Chr 18,1a
Marriage Alliance	————	2 Chr 18,1b
Treaty	1 Kgs 22,2-4	2 Chr 18,2-3
Prophecies	1 Kgs 22,5-28	2 Chr 18,4-27
Joint Campaign	1 Kgs 22,29-35	2 Chr 18,28-34
Ahab's Ignominious End	1 Kgs 22,36-38	————
Prophetic Rebuke	————	2 Chr 19,1-3
Residence in Jerusalem	————	2 Chr 19,4a

Even though the two accounts are very similar, their two divergent contexts generate different interpretations. Whereas in Chronicles this affair occurs in the context of Jehoshaphat's reign, in Kings this event takes place in the context of Ahab's reign. Although Jehoshaphat is mentioned in the Kings account, the major focus is upon Ahab and his arrogant treatment of Micaiah. Ongoing Syrian-Israelite tensions comprise the immediate background for this event in Kings and for Ahab this ill-fated incident is the final event in a series culminating in his inglorious death.

Coming at this point in Jehoshaphat's reign, the Israelite-Judean coalition against Ramoth-gilead is cast in a distinctly different light than in its placement in Kings. A number of features in the Chronicler's introduction to this incident are striking. First, he links this episode to the foregoing, by repeating his assertion that Jehoshaphat enjoyed "honor and riches in abundance" (2 Chr 18,1). This use of repetition effectively sets this episode apart from the preceding period of blessing. Second, the Chronicler adds that "Jehoshaphat became related to Ahab by marriage" (2 Chr 18,1). Presumably this marriage involved Jehoshaphat's son, Jehoram, and Ahab's daughter, Athaliah<sup>(29)</sup>.

A royal marriage between the families of the two partners is not surprising in the formation of a political league between two ancient Near Eastern states. Such marriage alliances "served to reinforce the political relationship, to assure the unwavering loyalty of the other"<sup>(30)</sup>. The Chronicler will develop the implications of this action in his depiction of Jehoram's reign, but it is significant that he already mentions it here as a pivotal point in Jehoshaphat's tenure. Moreover, while the Deuteronomist does not even mention this marriage alliance in the reign of Jehoshaphat, the Chronicler states that it precedes Jehoshaphat's military alliance with Ahab. Jehoshaphat's visit to Samaria, unexplained in Kings, is explained in Chronicles by the marriage alliance<sup>(31)</sup>.

Finally, the Chronicler describes another event not found in Kings: a lavish feast given by Ahab on behalf of Jehoshaphat at Samaria (18,2). It is while Jehoshaphat cavorts with Ahab, according to the Chronicler, that Ahab incites Jehoshaphat to accompany him on a campaign against Ramoth-gilead (18,2b). The *hiphil* of *syt* seems to be used here in the sense of enticement into apostasy<sup>(32)</sup>. By means of these additions, the Chronicler transforms the account he borrows from Kings, shifting more attention and responsibility to Jehoshaphat himself.

<sup>(29)</sup> 2 Chr 21,6; 22,2; cf. 2 Kgs 8,18.

<sup>(30)</sup> P. KALLUVEETIL, *Declaration and Covenant* (AnBib 88; Rome 1982) 80.

<sup>(31)</sup> J. Gray surmises that Jehoshaphat's journey to Samaria reflects a vassal treaty clause mandating periodic visits, *I and II Kings* (OTL; Philadelphia 1970) 449. For a different point of view, see DE VRIES, *I and 2 Chronicles*, 316.

<sup>(32)</sup> See Deut 13,6; 1 Kgs 21,25; 1 Chr 21,1, and the discussion of T. WILLI, *Die Chronik als Auslegung* (FRLANT 106; Göttingen 1972) 144.

Scholars have debated the nature of Ahab and Jehoshaphat's martial pact. The formulaic language of diplomacy used to confirm the military treaty: "You and I are as one, your people and my people as well" (*kmwny kmwk wk'mk 'my*; 1 Kgs 22,4//2 Chr 18,3) is used in both vassal treaties and in parity treaties<sup>(33)</sup>. Whatever the precise political dimensions of the covenant between Jehoshaphat and Ahab, the setting of the Chronicler's presentation renders such a measure completely unnecessary. Presiding over a militarily secure, internationally respected, and prosperous land, the Jehoshaphat of Chronicles has no ostensible reason for being lured into a treaty relationship with Ahab. Hence, in the Chronicler's shaping of this alliance, Jehoshaphat appears especially culpable.

Although the Chronicler does not rewrite the disastrous outcome of Ahab and Jehoshaphat's pact, he does make two additions which accentuate God's mercy to Jehoshaphat. In so doing, the Chronicler indirectly indicates his displeasure with Jehoshaphat. First, he notes that when Jehoshaphat was about to be attacked and cried out to YHWH, "God drew them away from him" (2 Chr 18,31). Second, he observes that Jehoshaphat, unlike Ahab, "returned in safety (*wayyašob yēhōšāpāt melek-yēhūdā 'el-bêtô bēšālôm*) to his palace in Jerusalem" (2 Chr 19,1). The Chronicler therefore considers Jehoshaphat one of the fortunate sheep in the prophet Micaiah's oracle: "They have no master; let them go home in peace" (*yāšūbū 'iš-lēbêtô bēšālôm*; 2 Chr 18,16//1 Kgs 22,17)<sup>(34)</sup>.

In addition to emphasizing God's clemency to Jehoshaphat, thereby indirectly implicating him, the Chronicler overtly condemns the alliance itself. In Chronicles a prophetic rebuke awaits the defeated Jehoshaphat upon his return to Jerusalem (2 Chr 19,2b-3). Since the background for Jehu's judgment oracle is Jehoshaphat's ill-fated coalition with Ahab, it is likely that in condemning Jehoshaphat for "loving those who hate YHWH", the seer is conveying more than simply his disapproval of Jehoshaphat's

<sup>(33)</sup> In vassal treaties, see, for instance, RS 17,340; 1 Kgs 20,4; and 1 Chr 12,18-19. For the use of the phrase in parity treaties, see RS 18,54 and Gen 34,15-22. According to 1 Kgs 22,3-4, a text unparalleled in Chronicles, it is in the context of Ahab's exhorting his "servants" that he proposes this joint venture to Jehoshaphat (vv. 3-4).

<sup>(34)</sup> Although spoken to both Ahab and Jehoshaphat, Micaiah's oracle is directed toward Ahab.

personal affection for King Ahab<sup>(35)</sup>. Such a verdict is confirmed by a close study of the formulaic language used in this oracle. "To help the wicked and love those who hate YHWH" recalls similar formulae in international diplomatic contexts: "Why do you love the 'Apiru and hate the governors?"<sup>(36)</sup>. As Moran has demonstrated, the verb *'āhēb* (and its Semitic analogues, e.g., Akkadian *rāmu*) is used in diplomatic settings to designate love in the sense of loyalty<sup>(37)</sup>. The verbs *śānē* and *'āzar* can also be found in covenantal contexts<sup>(38)</sup>.

There is, then, a more foundational issue at the root of Jehu's complaint than Jehoshaphat's personal or emotional involvement with Ahab. In fact, Jehu's judgment oracle does not identify exactly whether those who "hate YHWH" are Ahab's family, the entire northern royal house, or more broadly the Northerners themselves. The coalition itself is the focus of Jehu's diatribe. Whereas in 1 Kings 22 the relationship between Ahab and Jehoshaphat passes without comment, in Chronicles the alliance with Ahab becomes the point of contention. Jehoshaphat is being disloyal to his suzerain by "helping the wicked" and being loyal to "those who hate YHWH". Fidelity to one precludes fidelity to the other.

Although the Chronicler directly links the dramatic decline in Jehoshaphat's fortunes to the reversal in his policy toward Israel, his version of the joint expedition to Ramoth-gilead ends with a ray of hope. Whereas the beginning of the account finds Jehoshaphat travelling to Samaria, the end finds him still alive and apparently no longer making trips to the northern capital. The Chronicler's

<sup>(35)</sup> Contra MYERS, *II Chronicles*, 107, Jehoshaphat does not receive a "relatively mild" rebuke. On the contrary, the Chronicler is at pains to point out how merciful God is to Jehoshaphat. God's clemency and Jehoshaphat's good works (2 Chr 19,3) together ameliorate the effects of his apostasy.

<sup>(36)</sup> J. A. KNUDTZON, *Die El-Amarna Tafeln* (2 vols.; Leipzig 1915) 286,18-20.

<sup>(37)</sup> See KNUDTZON, *Die El-Amarna Tafeln*, 27,72-73; 53,40-44; 138,71-73; 1 Kgs 5,16, and the analysis of W. L. MORAN, "The Ancient Near Eastern Background to the Love of God in Deuteronomy", *CBQ* 25 (1963) 77-87.

<sup>(38)</sup> For the covenantal use of *śānē*, see Exod 20,5.6; Deut 5,9.10; 7,9.10, and the discussion of J. A. THOMPSON, "Israel's Haters", *VT* 29 (1979) 201-205. For the use of *'āzar* in covenantal contexts, see Josh 1,14; 10,4; 2 Sam 8,5; 2 Chr 26,13, and the treatment of K. BALTZER, *The Covenantal Formula in Old Testament, Jewish, and Early Christian Writings* (Philadelphia 1971) 73.

employment of *wayyēšeb* in 2 Chr 19,4a mirrors the usage of *wayyēšeb* in other biblical narratives to signal someone resuming residence following the conclusion of a flight or trip<sup>(39)</sup>. In this case, Jehoshaphat concludes this ignominious episode by taking up residence again in Jerusalem (2 Chr 19,4a).

### III. Judicial Reform (2 Chr 19,4b-11)

The Chronicler's juxtaposition of two discrete pericopes — Jehoshaphat's successes and his joint expedition to Ramoth-gilead — accentuates the differences between these two episodes in Jehoshaphat's life. The Chronicler establishes further stark contrasts between the weal and woe of Jehoshaphat's tenure by portraying two major episodes, unparalleled in Kings, which exalt Jehoshaphat: his judicial reform (2 Chr 19,4b-11) and his war against a coalition of southeastern powers (2 Chr 20,1-30). As is customary in paratactic composition, the narratives are only loosely linked together. In the case of Jehoshaphat's judicial reform, the observation that "Jehoshaphat took up residence in Jerusalem" (2 Chr 19,4a) concludes the account of his trip to Samaria (18,1-19,3) and forms a bridge to Jehoshaphat's judicial reform, "and he went out again among the people" (2 Chr 19,4b).

Given that Jehoshaphat has already instituted a reform (17,7-9), commentators have debated whether the earlier reform is simply a reflex of this reform or whether this reform represents a second, more extensive reformation<sup>(40)</sup>. In my judgment, both views are valid in what they affirm and mistaken in what they deny. Supporting the first view are the use of *wayyāšob* and the reference to "all the fortified cities of Judah" (2 Chr 19,5), which seem intentionally phrased to resonate with the earlier account<sup>(41)</sup>. Supporting the second view, the nature and content of this second endeavour extend beyond those of the first reform. In sum, 2 Chr

<sup>(39)</sup> Exod 2,15; Judg 9,21; 1 Sam 19,2; 23,14; 27,3; 1 Kgs 12,2. See further, J. C. TREBOLLE BARRERA, *Salomón y Jeroboán: Historia de la recensión y redacción de 1 Reyes 2-12, 14* (Institución San Jerónimo 10; Valencia 1980) 62-71.

<sup>(40)</sup> ALBRIGHT, "Judicial Reform", 82, for instance, sees the two reform accounts as a doublet.

<sup>(41)</sup> If 2 Chr 17,7-9 was simply a reflex of 19,4b-11, one would expect more convergence between the two narratives.

19,4b-11 depicts Jehoshaphat returning to and developing policies he instituted at the beginning of his reign.

Whereas at the inception of his reign Jehoshaphat consolidated his rule against Israel by stationing troops in the towns of Judah and Ephraim which he controlled (17,1-2), at the inception of this new phase of his reign Jehoshaphat personally travels among his people from Beer-sheba to the hill country of Ephraim, "restoring them to the God of their fathers" (2 Chr 19,4b). Whatever Jehoshaphat's "restoring them" amounted to, he is clearly reasserting his authority. The geographic scope of this restoration is extensive, reclaiming his entire realm, including sections of the northern kingdom over which he held sway. Hence, in contrast with the pattern of accommodation displayed in his dealings with Ahab, Jehoshaphat reverts to the pattern of consolidation which proved so successful in the first segment of his rule.

Jehoshaphat's restoration of his people, in turn, forms the basis for his renovation of his nation's judiciary. Having earlier stationed troops in all the fortified cities (17,2), Jehoshaphat now stations judges within each of these cities (19,5). Hence, Jehoshaphat's later reforms complement and build upon his earlier actions. Moreover, whereas the earlier reform disseminated the "scroll of the torah of YHWH" to the populace, this reform manifests a more specifically juridical character. Conforming to the ancient Near Eastern ideal of a just king, Jehoshaphat implements measures to eliminate bribery, perversion and partiality (19,6-9)<sup>(42)</sup>.

2 Chr 19,4b-11 presents a reformer king who reunites his people and embarks on an extensive renovation of his nation's system of justice. Consistent with the Chronicler's royal ideology, the king has a vital and active role to play, both in implementing this reformation and in supervising it<sup>(43)</sup>. The Chronicler also draws a link between

<sup>(42)</sup> See WHITELAM, *The Just King*, 17-37.

<sup>(43)</sup> Even though both Deuteronomy 16-18 and 2 Chr 19,5-11 advocate or depict centralization of justice, differences between the two should not be minimized. The Chronicler presents the king as having a pivotal role in the administration of justice, whereas Deut 17,8-13 relegates traditional royal judicial duties to a cultic center (the temple and its officials). See R. R. WILSON, "Israel's Judicial System in the Preexilic Period", *JQR* 74 (1983) 243-248 and B. LEVINSON, "The Hermeneutics of Innovation: The Impact of Centralization upon the Structure, Sequence, and Reformulation of Legal Material in Deuteronomy", Diss., Brandeis University, 1991.

Jehoshaphat's judicial reforms and the disastrous expedition to Ramoth-gilead. If, as Williamson points out, the alliance with Ahab provoked divine wrath (*qešep*), the overhaul of the judiciary demonstrates how divine wrath (*qešep*) can be averted<sup>(44)</sup>. 2 Chr 19,4b-11 therefore both resonates with Jehoshaphat's earlier reforms and forms a stark contrast with his ill-fated coalition with Ahab. Rather than seek gain through an unholy alliance, Jehoshaphat regroups and extends the kinds of policies which led to substantial blessings in the first part of his reign.

#### IV. Defeat of Foreign Coalition (20,1-30)

The second incident, highlighting Jehoshaphat's piety, recounts Jehoshaphat's exemplary response to an enemy invasion. As is typical in the Chronicler's depiction of Jehoshaphat, the Chronicler does not attempt to integrate this incident with the preceding. His transition between the two pericopes is simply, "And it happened after this" (2 Chr 20,1).

In this narrative Jehoshaphat is confronted with an invasion by "a great horde" of Moabites, Ammonites and Meunites<sup>(45)</sup>. Both Jehoshaphat and Judah resolve to seek YHWH in Jerusalem and in good sacral war fashion Jehoshaphat proclaims a national fast<sup>(46)</sup>. Standing in front of the new court at the temple, Jehoshaphat leads the nation in prayer (vv. 6-12) and hears a priestly oracle of victory (vv. 15-17).

The speeches and prayer in this account are remarkable for promoting a point of view diametrically opposed to the stance Jehoshaphat himself took in his alliance with Ahab. Jehoshaphat's prayer, like Hezekiah's prayer in the Assyrian crisis, appropriately acclaims divine rule over all the nations (20,6; cf. 2 Kgs 19,15,19). Similarly, his prayer ends with affirmation of complete dependence upon YHWH: "we do not know what to do, but our eyes are set upon you" (2 Chr 20,12).

<sup>(44)</sup> WILLIAMSON, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 279.

<sup>(45)</sup> In 2 Chr 20,1 the LXX has *Meinaiōn* rather than the MT's *h-mwnym*. Assuming an original *\*hm'wnym* ("the Meunites"), the MT reading may be the result of a metathesis. Elsewhere in the account, the third party is identified as the inhabitants of Mt. Seir (2 Chr 20,10.22.23). On the Meunites, see also 1 Chr 4,41; 2 Chr 26,7.

<sup>(46)</sup> 2 Chr 20,3-4; cf. 1 Sam 7,9; Judg 20,27; Joel 2,12; Jer 36,6,9; Zech 8,19.



The emphasis of complete reliance upon the deity is continued in Jahaziel's oracle, which assures Judah of victory and instructs them upon a proper course of action<sup>(47)</sup>. Expressing no doubts, the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem proceed the next day to the wilderness of Tekoa, where they are exhorted once more, in this case by Jehoshaphat. Drawing upon older sources, the king exhorts the people: "uphold your faith in YHWH your God that you may be upheld; trust in his prophets that you might succeed" (2 Chr 20,20). This adaptation and extension of Isaiah's admonition to a wavering King Ahaz (Isa 7,9) is particularly apt, because Ahaz was also confronted with an invading coalition of powers.

The resonance with the prophecies of Isaiah go even beyond Isa 7,4-9. Other Isaianic oracles condemning Judah's alliances and dependence upon other nations are more explicit in grounding the basis for Isaiah's hope (e.g., Isa 19,1-2; 30,27-30; 31,1-4; 37,33-35). Rather than Judah and its kings seeking security from abroad, Isaiah promises that "YHWH Sebaoth would descend to fight upon Mt. Zion and upon its hill" (Isa 31,4). Jehoshaphat, like Ahaz in the book of Isaiah, could be tempted to appeal to another power for aid or reach some sort of accommodation with his enemies. Nevertheless, Jehoshaphat remains firm. His response to this invasion is therefore a great counterexample to the accommodational approach he adopted earlier toward the northern kingdom.

Although the Chronicler earlier ascribed 1,160,000 troops to Jehoshaphat (2 Chr 17,14-19), he does not mention them now. Judeans accompany Jehoshaphat to battle, but they are of no martial consequence: this is a war between YHWH and the coalition. As in the sacral wars of old, YHWH throws the enemy into a panic resulting in their annihilation (vv. 22-23)<sup>(48)</sup>. Having witnessed their deity's victory, Judah need only gather the bountiful spoils, a process which takes no less than three days. After the people praise YHWH in the Valley of Berekah, they return to Jerusalem, bringing the story full circle.

The account of Jehoshaphat's war against the eastern coalition is skillfully written, exhibiting a unity of design and purpose. An

<sup>(47)</sup> Even though 2 Chr 20,1-30 may valorize Asaphite Levitical claims, I cannot agree that this is the chief purpose of 2 Chr 20,1-30 (*pace* D. PETERSEN, *Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles* [SBLMS 23; Missoula, MT 1977] 76-77).

<sup>(48)</sup> Judg 4,15; 7,22; 1 Sam 7,10; 14,20.

*inclusio* lends structural unity to the whole: whereas the beginning of national crisis finds Jehoshaphat and the people congregating and fasting at the temple, the end of the campaign finds Jehoshaphat and the people again at the temple in national celebration (20,27-28).

Although the narrative manifests numerous internal correspondences, there are few if any overt parallels within the narrative to other sections of Jehoshaphat's reign. In the epilogue to this story (2 Chr 20,29-30), the Chronicler does draw, however, a number of thematic parallels to the early part of Jehoshaphat's reign. Again "the fear of God" grips Judah's neighbors (2 Chr 17,10), in this case because "they heard that 'YHWH' fought with the enemies of Israel"<sup>(49)</sup>. Again the kingdom of Jehoshaphat is at peace (2 Chr 17,10), in this case "because God gave him rest all around" (2 Chr 20,30). Hence, the Chronicler shapes the aftermath of war as a reprise of certain themes he stressed in the first segment of Jehoshaphat's reign.

#### V. Renewed Evaluation (20,31-34)

The Chronicler's inclusion of the deuteronomistic introduction to and evaluation of Jehoshaphat at the conclusion of this campaign has long confounded scholars. Although 2 Chr 20,32 basically follows the Deuteronomist in stating that "he walked in all the way of Asa, not turning from it, doing right in the sight of YHWH", 2 Chr 20,33 emends the following qualification.

1 Kgs 22,44: 'ak habbāmôt lō'-sārū 'ōd hā 'ām mēzabbēhēm ūmēqatṭērīm babbāmôt.

2 Chr 20,33: 'ak habbāmôt lō'-sārū wē'od hā 'ām lō'-hēkīnū lēbābām lē' lōhē 'ābōtēhem.

Since the Chronicler modifies the deuteronomistic evaluation, one cannot argue that the Chronicler is blindly reproducing his *Vorlage*<sup>(50)</sup>. On the contrary, the alteration implies intentionality. Moreover, since the expressions *hkyn lbb* and *'lhy 'bwt* are favorites

<sup>(49)</sup> 2 Chr 20,29; cf. Josh 10,14,42; Judg 20,35.

<sup>(50)</sup> *Contra* JAPHET, *Ideology*, 219-221. The Chronicler is perfectly capable of departing from the evaluations in Kings. For instance, the Chronicler changes the deuteronomistic assessment of Rehoboam (2 Chr 12,14; cf. 1 Kgs 14,22-24) and includes no evaluation whatsoever of Abijah (2 Chr 13,1-23; cf. 1 Kgs 15,3) and Jehoahaz (2 Chr 36,2; cf. 2 Kgs 23,32).

of the Chronicler, one cannot easily dismiss 2 Chr 20,32-33 as a later scribal addition<sup>(51)</sup>.

But why would the Chronicler deliberately include a second evaluation? I suggest that the Chronicler is expressing some ambivalence toward the accomplishments of Jehoshaphat and the people of Judah during his reign<sup>(52)</sup>. Although he warmly endorses Jehoshaphat on both occasions, the Chronicler's final word on Judah is that the problems which Jehoshaphat had seemingly overcome at the beginning of his reign nevertheless persist. Far from being an awkward appendix with no intrinsic value in the Chronicler's presentation, these verses qualify the lasting significance of Jehoshaphat's reign.

#### VI. Failed Maritime Alliance (20,35-37)

The final episode in the Chronicler's presentation of Jehoshaphat, only loosely tied to the preceding notices (2 Chr 20,35), depicts Jehoshaphat entering into another alliance with the northern kingdom. The placement of this incident has, like the renewed evaluation of 20,31-34, caused problems for commentators. De Vries, for instance, calls 20,35-37 an "intrusive appendix"<sup>(53)</sup>. Perhaps, however, the location of this pericope is as much a pointer to what lies ahead in the reigns of succeeding kings, as it is an integral part of the Chronicler's narration of Jehoshaphat. As with Jehoshaphat's pact with Ahab, this league marks regression in Jehoshaphat's rule. More so than with the first pact, the context and the content of this venture in Chronicles diverge from the portrayal of this incident in Kings. The Chronicler has undoubtedly reworked his *Vorlage*, but the full extent of his rewriting is not known because there are divergent witnesses to this event in the Deuteronomistic History<sup>(54)</sup>.

<sup>(51)</sup> Contra RUDOLPH, *Chronikbücher*, 263. The collocation "God of the fathers" appears 27 times in Chronicles and only 19 times in the rest of the Bible. See JAPHET, *Ideology*, 14-19. The expression *h'kyn lb* is also a characteristic expression of the Chronicler, E. L. CURTIS-A. L. MADSEN, *The Books of Chronicles* (ICC; Edinburgh 1910) 30.

<sup>(52)</sup> As Japhet points out, kings in Chronicles are not the sole representatives of the people. The people themselves are an active force in history and, as such, are responsible for their own actions, *Ideology*, 411-428.

<sup>(53)</sup> DE VRIES, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 309.

<sup>(54)</sup> 3 Reigns 16,28c-g//1 Kgs 22,45-51. The relationship between these

In any case, the context for Jehoshaphat's shipbuilding venture diverges markedly in Chronicles. Having witnessed Jehoshaphat successfully executing a judicial reform and miraculously overcoming an immense invasion from Judah's southeastern neighbors, it comes as a surprise to see Jehoshaphat again ratifying a treaty with a king of Israel. As with the earlier league with Ahab, the context in Chronicles implicates Jehoshaphat in that Judah's king is in no need of an alliance with anyone. The contexts in Kings and Chronicles can be compared as follows.

Judicial Reforms	————	2 Chr 19,4-11
Victory vs. Coalition	————	2 Chr 20,1-30
Introduction	1 Kgs 22,41-42	2 Chr 20,31
Evaluation	1 Kgs 22,43-44	2 Chr 20,32-33
Pact with Israel	1 Kgs 22,45	————
Concluding Notice	1 Kgs 22,46	2 Chr 20,34
Reforms	1 Kgs 22,47	————
Regent in Edom	1 Kgs 22,48	————
Pact with Ahaziah	————	2 Chr 20,35-36
Shipbuilding Alliance	————	2 Chr 20,36
Prophetic Reprimand	————	2 Chr 20,37
Shipwreck	1 Kgs 22,49	2 Chr 20,37
Pact with Ahaziah Refused	1 Kgs 22,50	————

It seems evident that by means of omissions, alterations, re-arrangements and additions, the Chronicler has generated a presentation which diverges substantially from any of the witnesses in the Deuteronomistic History. The general pattern of the Chronicler's reworking his *Vorlage* involves a number of steps. First, he specifies that the treaty with the unnamed king of Israel mentioned in 1 Kgs 22,45 and 3 Reigns 16,28 was made with Ahaziah. Second, he places this notice at the beginning of his narrative, prior to any maritime proposal. The Chronicler thus formally links this covenant with the naval venture which follows<sup>(55)</sup>. Third, in 2 Chr 20,35-36 the

---

witnesses deserves a thorough study. Particularly interesting, in my estimation, is the OL in which seems to record a number of distinct variants to both the MT and the LXX.

<sup>(55)</sup> M. FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford 1985) 399-403, argues that this is an instance of *semûkîn*, whereby one statement is interpreted in light of another in close proximity.

Chronicler asserts that Jehoshaphat did in fact engage in a maritime alliance with Ahaziah of Israel to build ships to travel to Tarshish<sup>(56)</sup>.

The Chronicler expresses his disapproval of this pact through two additions to his *Vorlage*. He deems that it was evil for Jehoshaphat to have forged this treaty (*hû' hirsîa' la'âsôt*). Seconding this condemnation is a prophetic censure, "Because you allied yourself with Ahaziah, YHWH is breaking up your work" (2 Chr 20,37). Having added Eliezer's judgment oracle, the Chronicler is able to allude to 1 Kgs 22,49 as the fulfillment of prophecy, "and the ships were wrecked so that they were unable to go to Tarshish" (2 Chr 20,37). Hence, the Chronicler's systematic rewriting of his *Vorlage* generates a coherent alternative to the version in Kings.

Whereas neither Ahaziah's offer of assistance nor Jehoshaphat's decline is an issue in Kings, the Chronicler strongly and unequivocally condemns Jehoshaphat's actions. The coalition in and of itself is at issue. Eliezer's accusation unambiguously indicts Jehoshaphat for allying himself with Ahaziah of Israel. Whereas in Kings the maritime disaster is the occasion for Ahaziah's offer of a joint naval alliance, in Chronicles the maritime disaster is the deity's ordained punishment for the joint naval league between Ahaziah and Jehoshaphat. Hence, the Chronicler associates this coalition, like the coalition with Ahab, with apostasy, divine retribution and failure.

Consistent with the conventions of parataxis, the Chronicler does not write a climax to Jehoshaphat's tenure. Nevertheless, the positioning or sequence of pericopes in Jehoshaphat's reign is significant. If Jehoshaphat's reign begins with great promise, it ends more ominously. Beginning his reign by successfully consolidating his nation against its northern neighbor, Jehoshaphat ends his reign in a calamitous alliance with this same northern neighbor.

<sup>(56)</sup> Willi, *Chronik*, 219, argues that the Chronicler has interpreted the 'āmar of 1 Kgs 22,50 as a pluperfect and 'āz of v. 50 in the sense of "at that time". Ahaziah's offer would thus be understood to embrace not only the ships' journey, but also the construction of the ships as well. Willi fails to explain, however, why Jehoshaphat in both 1 Kings and 3 Reigns refuses the Israelite king's offer, while in Chronicles he freely aligns himself with Ahaziah. In my judgment, the Chronicler's compositional technique cannot be understood simply as interpretation of a *Vorlage*. The Chronicler is an author in his own right.

### Conclusions

In his extensive presentation of Jehoshaphat's reign, the Chronicler juxtaposes a Jehoshaphat who consolidates, reforms, fortifies, trusts and prays with a Jehoshaphat who ratifies treaties with northern kings. The former actions produce peace, justice, prosperity, military strength and victory, while the latter actions yield wrath, divine retribution and failure. The Chronicler neither reconciles these divergent portraits nor brings them to a single conclusion. He does not explain why a Jehoshaphat who amasses an army of 1,160,000 soldiers in Jerusalem alone engages a massive enemy invasion with women and children. Nor does the Chronicler explain Jehoshaphat's inconsistent relations with his northern counterparts. Given Jehoshaphat's great success in consolidating and restoring his nation, a domain which included portions of the northern kingdom, it remains unclear why Jehoshaphat ratifies two equally disastrous pacts with northern kings.

In my judgment, the Chronicler leaves the tensions between Jehoshaphat's actions unresolved to create the strongest possible contrasts between them. Rather than forming a single, uniform portrait of Jehoshaphat, the Chronicler employs parataxis to create a multi-sided portrait of this king. The conventions of parataxis enable the Chronicler to achieve clear thematic effects. Defining by analogy and contrast, the Chronicler creates a sophisticated pattern of cross-references between units, but with, paradoxically, little transition between them. Spectacular triumphs are juxtaposed to spectacular disasters, heightening the dramatic effects of Jehoshaphat's actions. Parataxis, therefore, embodies and furthers the content of the Chronicler's reconstruction.

By composing a multi-faceted presentation of Jehoshaphat, the Chronicler can both associate and disassociate this monarch from his successors. While the Chronicler contends that Jehoshaphat himself did not imitate the practices of the Omrides, the Chronicler clearly believes that Jehoshaphat's marriage alliance has only deleterious effects on his descendants. Rather than pursuing an alternative, more independent course of action, Jehoshaphat's successors only intensify the pattern of close cooperation with the North which he established. The effects of this affiliation with and emulation of northern practices eventually threaten to topple the very pillars upon which the nation is built. By the time of Athaliah's

interregnum, the Davidides have seemingly lost their throne (2 Chr 22,10), the priests and Levites have lost control of the temple (2 Chr 23,18), the temple resources have been dedicated to the Baals, and holocausts are no longer being regularly offered (2 Chr 23,18; 24,14)<sup>(57)</sup>.

Without having said anything about Jehoram, Ahaziah and Athaliah, the Chronicler, in his complex portrayal of Jehoshaphat, has proleptically pronounced his verdict upon the new era of rapprochement with the northern kingdom. Although the string of striking successes which Jehoshaphat enjoys are of various types, they all coalesce in depicting a king pursuing a sovereign course for the people under his domain, unfettered by accommodation with other nations. By implication these tremendous achievements impugn the course of collaboration with the North adopted by Jehoshaphat's successors: Jehoram, Ahaziah and Athaliah. The paratactic juxtaposition of Jehoshaphat's achievements with his failures therefore highlights the positive effects of the former, while reinforcing the negative effects of the latter.

Given the small numbers of Judeans and the vulnerable political and military position of Judah, the historical Jehoshaphat may have believed that a system of alliances constituted an expedient means to gain political legitimacy and economic stability. Accommodation with Israel, a people with whom Judah shared much in common, might merely have been seen as a pragmatic and prudent course of action in the world of *Realpolitik*. But through his rewriting of history, the Chronicler defies history. Although the Chronicler does not "hate Israel", neither does he embrace it<sup>(58)</sup>. Despite the division of the kingdom and his omission of the independent history of the northern kingdom, the Chronicler still considers Israel as composed of twelve tribes. Given, however, the northern tribes' rebellion against both YHWH's designated cult and king, only the southern tribes perpetuate the distinctive traditions of historic Israel. Although the Chronicler upholds the ideal of one Israel, he wants to dictate the terms under which this ideal could be realized. Hence, in his treatment of Jehoshaphat, one can discern the

<sup>(57)</sup> See S.J. DE VRIES, "The Schema of Dynastic Endangerment in Chronicles", *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies* 7 (1987) 59-77.

<sup>(58)</sup> See W.M.L. DE WETTE, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 2 vols. (Halle 1806-07) 126 and the critique of his position by H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles* (Cambridge 1977) 87-140.

Chronicler circumscribing what relations Judah should have (had) with its northern neighbor. The Chronicler favors the inclusion of northern territory and people under the domain of Jerusalem, but he categorically rejects treaties with their leaders. The Chronicler repudiates the position that treaties can accomplish political, military, or economic objectives. The dismal outcome of each pact directly contradicts its intent.

Through the tremendous contrast he draws between Jehoshaphat's failures and his accomplishments, the Chronicler advocates steering a course independent from Judah's neighbors and relying solely upon the deity. Limited resources, hostile neighbors, and a relatively small number of people in Judah are not obstacles in this ideology. The Chronicler's treatment of Jehoshaphat is therefore a *tour de force*. In the Chronicler's skillful reconstruction, Jehoshaphat's own reign constitutes a great counter-example to the influential but ill-fated pacts he makes with the northern kingdom. Judah under Jehoshaphat enjoys its most spectacular successes not when it stands with others, but when it stands alone<sup>(59)</sup>.

The Pennsylvania State Univ.  
University Park, PA 16802 USA

Gary N. KNOPPERS

## SOMMAIRE

Tout en admettant que Josaphat soit la figure la plus en vue des Chroniques, les exégètes discutent de deux points concernant la façon dont ces livres le présentent: le manque de lien entre les péripécies et les traités désastreux conclus par Josaphat avec Israël. En fait, ces deux points sont connexes. Les traités de Josaphat ont toute leur importance dans les Chroniques, car ces textes fournissent des exemples typiques du mode de composition paratactique propre à leur auteur. En racontant la carrière du roi, le Chroniste démontre que Josaphat s'est gardé d'imiter les pratiques des Omrides. Cependant, le même Chroniste soutient tout aussi clairement que les alliances de Josaphat avec Israël ont eu des effets funestes pour le roi et ses descendants. L'intérêt particulier du Chroniste pour la souveraineté de Juda explique plusieurs *crux* de sa présentation. Il construit son récit en vue de souligner les mérites d'un royaume de Juda indépendant qui s'appuie sur YHWH seul et ses torts lorsqu'il est dépendant et encombré par des alliances étrangères.

<sup>(59)</sup> I presented an earlier version of this paper at the 1991 annual meeting of the Eastern Great Lakes Biblical Society. I would like to thank Reuben Aharoni, John Briggs Curtis, Simon De Vries, Jared Jackson, and especially Terence Kleven for their helpful comments.



# ANIMADVERSIONES

## **“So Great is His Steadfast Love”: A Rhetorical Analysis of Psalm 103**

Psalm 103 has been characterized as “one of the purest blossoms on the tree of biblical faith”<sup>(1)</sup>. The magnificent poetic artistry of this psalm is recognized by all who study it. Yet, it seems that there is no consensus regarding the relationship between this artistry and the message of the psalm, a fact obviated by the wide variety of previous strophic analyses of this psalm. Some commentators break the psalm into three strophes<sup>(2)</sup>, some into four<sup>(3)</sup>, some into five<sup>(4)</sup>, and others

<sup>(1)</sup> A. WEISER, *The Psalms: A Commentary* (trans. H. Hartnell) (OTL; Philadelphia 1962) 657.

<sup>(2)</sup> According to the following scholars, the psalm falls into three strophes: vv. 1-5.6-18.19-22. J. A. ALEXANDER, *The Psalms, Translated and Explained*, Vol. II (New York 1873) 18; A. C. JENNINGS, *The Psalms, with Introductions and Critical Notes*, Vol. 2 (London 1885) 182-183; A. COHEN, *The Psalms* (London 1950) 336; and L. C. ALLEN, *Psalms 101-150* (WBC; Waco, TX 1983) 19-21.

<sup>(3)</sup> I am aware of seven different proposals for a four-part division of the psalm:

(1) A. A. ANDERSON, *The Book of Psalms*, Vol. II (NCB; London 1972) 712 — vv. 1-2.3-5.6-18.19-22;

(2) A. DEISSLER, *Le Livre des Psaumes* (trans. N. Boyer) (Paris 1968) 127-128 — vv. 1-2.3-5.6-19.20-22;

(3) G. RAVASI, *Il Libro dei Salmi. Commento e Attualizzazione*. Volume III<sup>o</sup> (101-150). Quarta edizione. (Bologna 1988) 51-77 — vv. 1-2.3-10.11-19.20-22;

(4) W. E. BARNES, *The Psalms, with Introduction and Notes*, Vol. II (London 1931) 485-488; and D. KIDNER, *Psalms 73-150: A Commentary on Books III-V of the Psalms* (London 1975) 363-367 — vv. 1-5.6-14.15-18.19-22;

(5) W. S. MCCULLOUGH—F. H. BALLARD, “The Book of Psalms”, *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. IV (ed. G. A. BUTTRICK) (Nashville 1955) 345 — vv. 1-5.6-13.14-18.19-22;

(6) M. DAHOOD, *Psalms III: 101-150*, (AB; Garden City 1970) 24; and L. SABOURIN, *The Psalms: Their Origin and Meaning* (New York 1969) 192-194 — vv. 1-5.6-10.11-18.19-22;

(7) G. A. F. KNIGHT, *Psalms*, Vol. 2 (Daily Study Bible; Philadelphia 1983) 136-141 — vv. 1-5.6-12.13-18.19-22.

<sup>(4)</sup> The most popular demarcation is vv. 1-5.6-10.11-14.15-18.19-22. So E. W. HENGSTENBERG, *Commentary on the Psalms*, Vol. III (Edinburgh 1863) 224; F. J. DELITZSCH, *Biblical Commentary on the Psalms*, Vol. III (trans. David Eaton) (New York 1889) 88; A. F. KIRKPATRICK, *The Book of Psalms* (Cambridge 1902; 1951 reprint) 600; N. H. PARKER, “Psalm 103: God is Love. He Will Have Mercy and Abundantly Pardon”, *CJT* 1 (1955) 193-195; S. TERRIEN, *The Psalms and Their Meaning for Today* (Indianapolis 1967) 206-207.

Other opinions include G. H. A. VON EWALD, *Commentary on the Psalms*, Vol. II (trans. E. Johnson) (London 1881) 281-284 — vv. 1-5.6-9.10-13.14-18.19-22; A. C. GAEBELEIN, *The Book of Psalms, a Devotional and Prophetic Commentary* (New

into six<sup>(5)</sup> or even nine strophes<sup>(6)</sup>. Each analysis gives a slightly different understanding of the psalm's meaning and purpose. None of these is based on a thorough rhetorical analysis of the psalm, though.

Leslie Allen<sup>(7)</sup> takes the first steps toward providing such a rhetorical analysis of Psalm 103 when he remarks on the need to use both "exegetical" (thematic) and stylistic evidence in analyzing the psalm, particularly its main section (vv. 6-18 [19]). Most attempts at subdividing this main section of the psalm, he says, have been "purely exegetical and receive no support from the stylistic evidence". In other words, most commentators discuss the structure of the psalm solely in terms of the impressions they have as to the development of certain ideas or themes in the psalm. Allen implies that the conclusions drawn from such impression-based analyses should be accepted with some degree of skepticism, unless they can be corroborated with evidence derived from stylistic elements of the psalm. He mentions some of these elements in his commentary, but the commentary format restricts him from providing a more detailed rhetorical analysis<sup>(8)</sup>.

The purpose of this paper is to provide one such analysis. In many respects, this will simply constitute an alternative to Allen's proposals (see n. 17, below). This will not be an exhaustive study, but it will give one example of how both poetic style and the development of themes must be appreciated in a rhetorical analysis of a psalm. A recognition of stylistic divisions and links should lead to a clearer recognition of a psalm's major teachings. In the case of Psalm 103, I have concluded that the strophic structures are marked most often, though not always, by stylistic features found at the beginning of cola. The unity of strophes and links between strophes are based mostly on that criterion in the present analysis. Considerations of thematic developments in the psalm are used to confirm the suggested strophic divisions.

### *Division of Psalm 103 into Strophes*

The following translation is extremely literal, so that the English reader can sense more precisely the Hebrew line structures. The particular strophic division given will be explained below.

---

York 1939) 377-381 — vv. 1-2.3-7.8-12.13-18.19-22; E. A. LESLIE, *The Psalms* (Nashville 1949) 47 — vv. 1-2.3-5.6-14.15-18.19-22; E. J. KISSANE, *The Book of Psalms*, Vol. III (Dublin 1954) 147 — vv. 1-5.6-9.10-14.15-18.19-22; WEISER, *The Psalms*, 658 — vv. 1-2.3-5.6-13.14-18.19-22.

<sup>(5)</sup> J. CALVIN, *Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, Vol. IV (trans. James Anderson) (Grand Rapids 1949) 125 — vv. 1-5.6-8.9-12.13-16.17-18.19-22; and P. DRIVERS, *The Psalms: Their Structure and Meaning* (London 1965) 237 — vv. 1-2.3-5.6-9.10-14.15-19.20-22; C. WESTERMANN, *The Living Psalms* (trans. J. R. Porter) (Grand Rapids 1989) 238 — vv. 1-2.3-5.6-7.8-18.19.20-22.

<sup>(6)</sup> C. A. BRIGGS, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, Vol. 2 (ICC; New York 1907) 324-327 — vv. 1-2.3-5.6-7.8-9.10.11-12.13-14.15-18.19-22.

<sup>(7)</sup> *Psalms 101-150*, 21.

<sup>(8)</sup> Allen himself is among those who have provided detailed rhetorical analyses of other psalms. See his "The Value of Rhetorical Criticism in Psalm 69", *JBL* 105 (1986) 577-598. For another recent rhetorical analysis, see P. AUFFRET, "Dans ta force se réjouit le roi": Étude structurelle du Psaume XXI", *VT* 40 (1990) 385-410.

## Psalm 103

*Strophe I: Vv. 1-5*

- 1 Bless, o my soul, the Lord;  
and all that is within me, his holy name.
- 2 Bless, o my soul, the Lord,  
and forget not all his benefits;
- 3 he who forgives all your iniquity,  
he who heals all your diseases,
- 4 he who redeems from the Pit your life,  
he who crowns you with steadfast love and mercy,
- 5 he who satisfies with good(ness) your continued existence;  
renewed like the eagle is your youth.

*Strophe II: Vv. 6-10*

- 6 Doing righteous deeds is the Lord,  
and just deeds for all the oppressed.
- 7 He revealed (°) his ways to Moses,  
to the children of Israel his actions.
- 8 Merciful and gracious is the Lord,  
slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love.
- 9 Not continually does he accuse,  
and not forever is he angry.
- 10 Not according to our sins does he do to us,  
and not according to our wrongs does he repay us.

*Strophe III: Vv. 11-14*

- 11 For as high as the heavens are over the earth,  
(so) great is his steadfast love over those who fear him.
- 12 As far as east is from west,  
(so) he distances from us our transgressions.
- 13 As a father has mercy on children,  
(so) the Lord has mercy on those who fear him.
- 14 For he knows our form,  
he remembers that dust are we.

*Strophe IV: Vv. 15-19*

- 15 Man: as grass are his days,  
as the flower of the field, so he blooms.
- 16 For the wind passes over it and it is no more,  
and it is no longer recognized by its home.
- 17 But the steadfast love of the Lord is from everlasting  
to everlasting upon those who fear him,  
and his righteousness to children of children,

(°) Prof. Allen suggested this reading to me in correspondence. The verb form is imperfect, but it most naturally has a preterite function here. See GKC §107a-d.

- 18           to those keeping his covenant,  
               and to those remembering his instructions, to do them.  
 19 The Lord in the heavens has established his throne,  
       and his kingship over all has dominion.

*Strophe V: Vv. 20-22*

- 20 Bless the Lord, o his angels,  
       o mighty ones who do his word,  
       listening to the sound of his word.  
 21 Bless the Lord, all his armies,  
       his servants who do his will.  
 22 Bless the Lord, all his works,  
       in all the places of his dominion.  
       Bless, o my soul, the Lord.

*Strophe I: Vv. 1-5*

Almost every commentator sees a break in the flow of the psalm between vv. 5 and 6<sup>(10)</sup>. Some also see a break between vv. 2 and 3<sup>(11)</sup>. This might be justified stylistically, because vv. 1-2 both begin with "Bless...", while vv. 3-5 consist of a series of participial phrases ("he who..."; in Hebrew, this is the article *ha-* + a participle). On the other hand, vv. 3-5 do not contain independent sentences. Rather, they contain a series of participial phrases subordinated to v. 2. They explicate "the Lord". "The Lord" (v. 2) is "he who forgives...", "he who heals...", etc. (vv. 3-5). Further, the presence of an extended colon in v. 5 signals the conclusion of one section, while the re-introduction of "the Lord" in v. 6 indicates a new beginning, which was not necessary in v. 3. Also, the shift to an unarticulated participle at the beginning of v. 6 serves as a nice transition to the next strophe. Therefore, for stylistic and thematic reasons, vv. 1-5 are to be read as a single strophe.

V. 5 actually serves two functions. Besides signalling (stylistically) the end of the opening strophe, it sets the stage (thematically) for vv. 6-10, which are derived from Exod 33,12-34,7 (see below). In v. 5, the psalmist describes the Lord as "he who satisfies with good (*tôb*) your continued existence". I would suggest that *tôb* ("good") here should be repointed as *tûb* ("goodness") (cp. Ps 65,5). In conjunction with the "name" of the Lord (v. 1), this would recall Exod 33,19, where the Lord's "goodness" (*tûb*) and "name" (the main theme of the Exodus passage) are parallel to one another. If so, then the idea of the "goodness" of the Lord (which is important in Exod 33,12-34,7) might have been introduced here to prepare the reader for vv. 6-10 (which draw heavily from Exod 33,12-34,7).

<sup>(10)</sup> For exceptions, see GAEBELEIN, 377-381; RAVASI, 66-71.

<sup>(11)</sup> GAEBELEIN, 377-381; RAVASI, 65-66; ANDERSON, 712; LESLIE, 47; DEISSLER, 127-128; WEISER, 658; DRIJVERS, 237; BRIGGS, 324; WESTERMANN, 238.

## Strophe II: Vv. 6-10

Several commentators do not divide vv. 6-18(19) into separate strophes<sup>(12)</sup>. This might be justified thematically<sup>(13)</sup>, but I feel there are sufficient stylistic reasons, supported by thematic reasons, for subdividing them<sup>(14)</sup>. Also, the majority<sup>(15)</sup> would locate the end of this main body of the psalm in v. 18, not in v. 19, as I am proposing. I will explain my reasons for this decision momentarily. First, however, I will remark on stylistic and thematic features that warrant the separation of vv. 6-19 into smaller strophes.

The justification for isolating vv. 6-10 as an independent strophe is exhibited thematically more than stylistically. Only one stylistic indicator of the unity and completeness of vv. 6-10 suggests itself. There is an inclusio between vv. 6 and 10 based on the verb *šh*, "to do"<sup>(16)</sup>. In v. 6, the Lord is "doing deeds of righteousness and justice"; and in v. 10, he "does not do to us according to our sins". The two ideas are complementary. The fact that the Lord does righteous and just deeds is demonstrated first and foremost by the fact that he does not punish Israel as much as her sins warrant<sup>(17)</sup>. Thus, the theme of what the Lord "does" for his people frames this strophe.

The contents of this strophe are derived from the account of the proclamation of God's name in Exod 33,12-34,7. Ps 103,7a is an obvious allusion to Exod 33,12-13<sup>(18)</sup>, which is part of the dialogue between Moses and the Lord leading up to the proclamation of the name of the Lord, given in Exod 34,5-7. Ps 103,8 is an almost verbatim quote of a clause from Exod 34,6. Ps 103,9-10, which are tightly bound together stylistically (each colon of vv. 9-10 begins with the Hebrew negative *lō* ["not"]), are a paraphrase

<sup>(12)</sup> See n. 2, above.

<sup>(13)</sup> For example, the present strophic demarcations would tend to separate the themes of God's righteousness, grace and mercy (Ps 103,6-8) and the covenant (Ps 103,18), themes which are intertwined in Psalm 111. See n. 17, below.

<sup>(14)</sup> Contra ALLEN, *Psalms 101-150*, 21.

<sup>(15)</sup> The exceptions are DEISSLER, 127-128; DRIJVERS, 237; WESTERMANN, 238; and RAVASI, 71-76.

<sup>(16)</sup> The use of inclusio structures is common in the psalm. Again, see ALLEN, *Psalms 101-150*, 21.

<sup>(17)</sup> At this point one must consider an opposing view, set forth by ALLEN, *Psalms 101-150*, 21. He argues that the root *šh* forms an inclusio between vv. 6 and 18, rather than between vv. 6 and 10, as argued here. In fact, the same root also appears in vv. 20-22, so that one could argue that the inclusio extends to the end of the psalm, if this were the only criterion being used. Similar examples of multiple usages of a word could be cited. This simply exposes the inherent subjectivity of doing this sort of analysis. As Allen states, one must bring together a variety of indicators, both stylistic and thematic, in trying to determine the extent of the various strophes and how they are linked together. In this case, a combination of positive and negative statements of what the Lord "does" for his people (vv. 6 and 10) seems to form a stronger inclusio than a combination of statements of what the Lord "does" for his people (v. 6) and how his people "do" his instructions (v. 18).

<sup>(18)</sup> Exod 33,12-13 read, "And Moses said to the Lord... 'And now, if I have found favor in your eyes, reveal to me your ways...'" (*hōdī 'ēnī nā' 'et dērākekā*). Ps 103,7a reads, "He revealed his ways to Moses" (*yōdī'a dērākāyw lēmōšeh*).

of Exod 34,7. Thus, Ps 103,7-10 is partially a quotation of and partially an allusion to Exod 33,12-34,7<sup>(19)</sup>.

This creates a minor problem, however, when one tries to explain how v.6 fits into the strophe, because the themes of "righteousness" and "justice" mentioned in v.6 are not found in Exod 33,12-34,7. There is a clear break between vv.5 and 6 (see above), so one should not attempt to extend the opening strophe into v.6. On the other hand, it would be even more awkward to isolate v.6 as an independent strophe.

The solution is found by considering other passages where these two sets of themes ("righteousness" and "justice", and the themes found in Exod 33,12-34,7) are linked together. I am aware of only two other passages, both psalms, which do so. Both are generally considered to be late (i.e., post-exilic) in date. The strongest comparisons can be made with Ps 116,5, where mention of God's "righteousness" is inserted into another near-quote of a phrase from Exod 34,6. The occasion for Psalm 116 also parallels Psalm 103. In both instances, the psalmists seem to have been recently delivered from a life-threatening illness (see n.30, below). Aramaisms in Psalm 116 suggest a post-exilic date for its composition<sup>(20)</sup>. Linkage of "righteousness" and "justice" with themes from Exod 33,12-34,7 is also present in Psalm 111, where the Lord's "righteousness" is mentioned in v.3, just prior to a direct allusion to Exod 34,6, in v.4b. Several other elements of that psalm are also present in Psalm 103<sup>(21)</sup>. Evidence of wisdom influence in Psalm 111 suggests a post-exilic date for its composition.

This leads to two conclusions. First, although the linkage of "righteousness" and "justice" with themes from Exod 33,12-34,7 in Ps 103,6-10 is unusual, it is not unparalleled in the Hebrew Bible. Therefore, there is thematic justification for the unity of all of Ps 103,6-10. Second, the apparently late date of parallel examples suggests that this particular combination of themes represents a secondary or tertiary development in the utilization of Exod 33,12-34,7 by biblical writers<sup>(22)</sup>. This might also explain the paucity of examples of this combination of themes.

<sup>(19)</sup> There are more than thirty other references to Exod 34,6-7, scattered throughout the Hebrew Bible. See J. SCHARBERT, "Formgeschichte und Exegese von Ex 34,6f. und seiner Parallelen", *Bib* 38 (1957) 13-50; T.B. DOZEMAN, "Inner-Biblical Exegesis of Yahweh's Gracious and Compassionate Character", *JBL* 108 (1989) 207-223; and H. SPIECKERMANN, "»Barmherzig und gnädig ist der Herr...«", *ZAW* 102 (1990) 1-18. Spieckermann lists seven direct quotes of Exod 34,6-7 and approximately two dozen allusions to it. He does not include Ps 25,4-7 in his list of passages which allude to Exod 34,6-7; but, in that section of the psalm, there are at least a half dozen verbal correspondences with Exod 33,12-34,7.

<sup>(20)</sup> ALLEN, *Psalms 101-150*, 114.

<sup>(21)</sup> Most noticeable are the references to the Lord's "works" (103,6.10.22; 111,2.4.6.7). Significant also are phrases like "those who fear him" (103,11.13.17; 111,5), "his covenant" (103,18; 111,5.9), and "his (holy) name" (103,1; 111,9). Additional comparisons between Psalm 111 and Psalm 25 (see n.19, above) could also prove insightful. Both are acrostic psalms, and both contain many of the themes mentioned here.

<sup>(22)</sup> Cp. SPIECKERMANN, "Barmherzig", 1-18. This lends support to the general consensus that Psalm 103 itself is of relatively late composition.

## Strophe III: Vv. 11-14

There is a stylistic demarcation in vv. 11-14, tying these verses together as a unit while simultaneously separating them from the preceding and succeeding strophes. The first and last bicolon of this strophe begin with *kî* ("for"), forming another inclusio (see n. 16). Also, the intervening bicola (vv. 12 and 13) both begin with the preposition *kě* ("as, like"). The result is a series of four bicola, each beginning with the Hebrew letter *kaph* (*kî kě-... kě-... kě-... kî...*). This sets off these four verses as a separate strophe, both visually and orally. This stylistic demarcation is confirmed thematically. The three similes in vv. 11-13 (each introduced by *kě*-) describe the limitlessness of God's grace and mercy toward his people, and v. 14 provides an explanation for that fact (cp. Ps 78,36-39).

This strophe (vv. 11-14) is supplementary to the one preceding (vv. 6-10). The two are so tightly bound, in fact, that one might consider them to comprise one strophe<sup>(23)</sup>. To the contrary, however, the direct allusions to and quotations of Exod 33,12-34,7 obviously end with v. 10. Vv. 11-14 provide an expansion of one major idea from that passage — God's forgiveness — specified in v. 10; but vv. 11-14 are not a continuation of the direct appropriation of the entire Exodus passage. The reader is prepared for this connection stylistically in v. 10 by the repetition of *lô' kě*- in both cola. This is then contrasted somewhat by the repetition of *kě*- in vv. 11-13. The idea expressed negatively in v. 10, which closes one strophe, is expanded positively in the succeeding strophe. Thus, v. 10 sets the stage for the following strophe (cp. on v. 5, above).

## Strophe IV: Vv. 15-19

The idea of v. 14 (human mortality) is so closely tied to that of the succeeding strophe (vv. 15-19) that one might include it in that strophe; but again, there are stylistic and thematic reasons to separate it from them. Stylistically, we have already noted the inclusio formed by *kî* in vv. 11 and 14. There is a corresponding inclusio in vv. 15 and 19 (see below). These inclusions suggest that vv. 11-14 and vv. 15-19 are to be viewed separately. This is supported thematically. The humans considered in v. 14 are "we", the members of the covenant community. But in vv. 15-16, humanity in general is considered. "We" share with all humanity our mortality, and this is the link which the psalmist uses for his transition from v. 14 to the succeeding strophe. But it is a transition. V. 14 provides an explanation for why the Lord can be understanding enough to be so loving, while vv. 15ff. contrast the permanence of his love to the uncertainty of human love. Thus, just as v. 10 sets the stage for vv. 11-14, v. 14 sets the stage for vv. 15-19.

Most commentators place the end of this strophe in v. 18, primarily because they see a close thematic association between v. 19 and vv. 20-22. V. 19 mentions the Lord's universal dominion, and subsequent verses contain exhortations to members of that kingdom to join in praising their

<sup>(23)</sup> See nn. 2 and 3 (above), and LESLIE, 47; WEISER, 658; WESTERMANN, 238.

king<sup>(24)</sup>. Allen cites the use of the root *mšl* ("have dominion") in vv. 19 and 22 as a stylistic element (another inclusio) marking the extent of the strophe; but I would argue that there are at least two stylistic links between vv. 15 and 19 which override that apparent linkage and indicate the unity of vv. 15-19<sup>(25)</sup>. First, the traditional demarcation (between vv. 18 and 19) leaves v. 19 as the only bicolon in the concluding strophe which does not begin with "Bless the Lord...". Second, vv. 15 and 19 are the only verses in the entire psalm in which the noun appears first. This creates a syntactical inclusio between vv. 15 and 19. In fact, the word order of both cola in v. 19 is identical to the word order in v. 15a. This compels us to further examination of these lines.

A slightly less literal but more understandable translation of v. 15a than that given above would be:

As for man, like the grass are his days.  
(*'ēnōš keḥāṣîr yāmayw*)

This verse contains an example of *casus pendens*. The initial noun ("man") is juxtaposed to the rest of the colon. It is not the subject of the clause; "his days" is the subject. "Man" is in apposition to "his" in "his days". Several other examples of this syntactical structure are cited in *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §143. For instance, Ps 18,31a (= 2 Sam 22,31a); 104,17b; 125,2a; Eccl 2,14<sup>(26)</sup>.

It is possible to read Ps 103,19 in the same way. The word order (noun+prepositional phrase+verb) is the same as that found in Pss 103,15a; 104,17b; and Eccl 2,14b. If 103,19 were read as an example of *casus pendens*, the following translation would result:

As for the Lord, in the heavens he has established his throne;  
and as for his kingship, over all it has dominion.  
(*yhwḥ baššāmayim ḥēkîn kis'ô*  
*ûmalkûtô bakkôl māsālāh*)

This translation is forced, though. It would be easier to accept, for example, had the author used the passive or stative form of the verb ("has been established" or "is established") in the first colon. Since he does not, the more usual understanding of this verse is to be adopted.

<sup>(24)</sup> This is argued most strongly by O. LORETZ, *Die Psalmen. Beitrag der Ugarit-Texte zum Verständnis von Kolometrie und Textologie der Psalmen. 2. Psalm 90-150* (AOAT 207/2; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1979) 489. Loretz believes that Ps 103,19-22 form an originally independent piece, which has been added to an earlier version of the psalm. As parallels to the thought of v. 19, he cites Pss 93,1-2; 95,3; 96,4; 97,9; 98,1; and 99,2. Of these six examples, only Psalm 99 has the announcement of God's kingship and a call to praise him in what appears to be a single strophe.

<sup>(25)</sup> Contra Allen, I would suggest that the root *mšl* helps to set the stage for the theme of the succeeding strophe.

<sup>(26)</sup> Numerous other examples could be cited. Perhaps the most famous is in Josh 24,15, where Joshua says, "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord" (*wē'ānōkî ûbēti na'ābōd 'et yhwḥ*). See also Josh 24,17.



Nevertheless, the word order in v. 19 is unusual, and the fact that it matches precisely the word order in v. 15a must be more than a coincidence. The reason for the parallel, I would argue, is to highlight a contrast that the psalmist wishes to make between "man" and "the Lord" in this strophe. Many commentators have identified the theme of vv. 15 ff. as a contrast between transitory man and the eternal Lord<sup>(27)</sup>. This syntactical observation demonstrates how explicit the author intended the contrast to be. The strophe begins by placing the spotlight on "man". He is temporary like the grass of the fields, and he does not have a permanent home ("place"). The strophe ends with the spotlight on "the Lord". His home ("throne") is permanently established.

A thematic consideration confirms the need for a break, suggested by these syntactic considerations, between vv. 19 and 20. Contrary to what many commentators have said, v. 19 does not function as the thematic introduction to vv. 20-22. Like vv. 5, 10 and 14, it rounds off the strophe which it concludes while introducing an idea which serves to set the stage for the following strophe. V. 19 speaks of the permanence of the Lord and his sovereignty; but vv. 20-22 are concerned with the individuals over whom He exercises sovereignty, not the permanence of that sovereignty. So, while it is true that vv. 19-22 all deal with the sovereignty of the Lord, they are not necessarily a thematic unit, because they deal with different aspects of that sovereignty.

#### Strophe V: Vv. 20-22

With the exclusion of v. 19 from the concluding strophe, its syntactic and thematic unity is seen more precisely. Simultaneously, this strophe ties the entire psalm together by reminding the reader of ideas expressed earlier. Each verse begins with a call to some part of God's kingdom to "Bless the Lord". The inclusio formed with the opening verses cannot be missed. The threefold repetition of the root *ʾbh* also cements the ties among the three verses of this final strophe. At the same time, it causes the reader to think again about what the Lord "does" for his covenant people (vv. 6 and 10) to reveal his "name" to them.

#### *Summary of the Present Strophic Analysis*

An analysis of this sort is a complicated matter. It is easy to lose sight of the whole by focusing on the parts. Yet, a careful examination of the parts is necessary to understanding the whole. Therefore, before setting out an exposition of the message of the whole psalm, I will briefly summarize my conclusions as to the extent of each of the parts (strophes).

The transition from the first strophe (vv. 1-5) to the second (vv. 6-10) is marked stylistically in three ways: (1) the change from articulated participles (vv. 3-5) to an unarticulated participle (v. 6); (2) the expanded colon in v. 5 that breaks the pattern set up in the preceding verses; and (3)

<sup>(27)</sup> HENGSTENBERG, 224; BARNES, 485-488; DAHOOD, 24; KISSANE, 147; PARKER, 195; KIDNER, 363-367; WEISER, 658; TERRIEN, 207.

the use of "the Lord" in v. 6. V. 5, which concludes the first strophe, sets the stage for the development of the main theme in the second strophe by mentioning the Lord's "goodness", a significant term in Exod 33,12-34,7. The second strophe is demarcated stylistically by an inclusio based on the use of the root *ʕh* in vv. 6 and 10. Thematically, this strophe is unified around the appropriation of Exod 33,12-34,7 by the psalmist. The final verse of this strophe (v. 10) focuses on the idea of forgiveness, which is the theme expanded upon in the subsequent strophe (vv. 11-14). This third strophe is also demarcated by an inclusio, this time involving the particle *kî* in vv. 11 and 14. V. 14 sets the stage for the following strophe by introducing the idea of human mortality. This fourth strophe (vv. 15-19) is demarcated stylistically by a syntactic inclusio involving vv. 15a and 19. This inclusio highlights the thematic unifier of this strophe, viz., a contrast between mortal man and immortal God. V. 19 sets the stage for the concluding strophe by introducing the theme of the Lord's dominion. This strophe is demarcated stylistically and thematically by the repetition of the phrase "Bless the Lord", a phrase which also creates an inclusio for the entire psalm, pointing the reader back to vv. 1-2.

In sum, the use of of inclusio is a major stylistic device in this psalm, as many have noted previously. What has not been recognized sufficiently is the extent to which inclusions demarcate the individual strophes of the psalm. The major inclusio formed by the introduction and conclusion (vv. 1-2 with vv. 20-22) brackets the entire psalm. Three lesser inclusions (vv. 6 and 10, vv. 11 and 14, and vv. 15 and 19) bracket the three strophes which make up the main body of the psalm. Each strophe has its own special theme, which is introduced in the final verse of the preceding strophe. In coordination with other stylistic features, these ties help to smooth over the transitions from one strophe to the next.

### *Interpretation of Psalm 103, Based on This Analysis*

The most important benefit derived from this complex analysis is a clarification of the fact that the focus of this psalm is on the Lord and manifestations of his mercy and grace. It will now be shown how the combinations of stylistic and thematic features mentioned above point to this conclusion.

In the psalm's opening strophe (vv. 1-5), one might initially be misled into thinking that the focus is on the psalmist, as he calls upon himself to praise God. One might see in the opening lines an emphasis on the need for the worshiper to create an internalistic, contemplative frame of mind when worshipping. This impression is dispelled, however, when we realize that the psalmist chooses to elaborate on the object of his worship — the Lord — in vv. 3-5, rather than on himself. Recognition of the syntactic link between vv. 1-2 and 3-5 (i.e., the use of a series of participial phrases in vv. 3-5 to describe the Lord, who is introduced in vv. 1-2) brings out this perspective.

The repetition of "the Lord" in v. 6, along with the use of a clause-initial participle, indicates that the Lord is still the main focus as one moves to the second strophe. The psalmist has set the stage for focusing on

the proclamation of God's "name" (Exod 33,12-34,7) in vv.6-10 by alluding to the Lord's "goodness" (a parallel term to "name" in Exod 33,19) in v. 5. The central idea of this strophe (vv.6-10) is expressed in its middle verse, v. 8, which the psalmist quotes from Exod 34,6, rather than paraphrasing. The evidence of the Lord's grace and mercy (v.8) is stated positively and negatively in the surrounding verses — positively in vv.6-7, negatively in vv.9-10. The negative aspect of this contrast is obvious in the repetition of the negative in each colon of vv.9-10. But the fact that a contrast is being made is seen in the contrastive use of the root *šh*, contrasting what the Lord "does" (v.6a) to what he "does not do" (v.10a). By appropriating Exod 33,12-34,7 into his psalm, the author implies that, in the action for which the psalmist is praising him (in vv.1-5), the Lord has once again lived up to his "name" as revealed to Moses centuries earlier. He has again shown that he is the one who is "merciful and gracious, slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love" <sup>(28)</sup>.

The third strophe (vv.11-14) elaborates further on some of the qualities associated with the Lord's "name" in Exod 34,6-7, particularly his forgiveness. A closer look at the syntax of vv.11-13 draws this out. The verses begin *kî kě... kě... kě...* ("for as..., as..., as..."), respectively. The use of *kî* ("for") in v.11 is matched in v.14, forming an inclusio for the strophe (see above); but the threefold use of *kě* in vv.11-13 demonstrates a particular unity of thought among those verses <sup>(29)</sup>. Through the parallelism of this sequence, the abstract notions of the Lord's "steadfast love" (v.11) and "mercy" (v.13), which appear to be the central ideas of vv.6-10, are shown to be concretely exemplified when the Lord "distances from us our transgressions" (v.12). This specific focus on forgiveness given to God's "steadfast love" and "mercy" is foreshadowed by the reference to forgiveness in v.10. This thematic foreshadowing is paralleled stylistically in the use of the preposition *kě-* (cp. the dual use of *lō' kě-* in v.10 with *kî kě-* in vv.11ff.). Based on the fact that forgiveness is the concrete manifestation of the Lord's "love" and "mercy" which is emphasized in this strophe, in conjunction with the fact that forgiveness is the main theme of the introduction (see esp. vv.3-4a), it logical to conclude that the specific occasion for this psalm is some manifestation of God's forgiveness to the psalmist, probably the healing of some disease <sup>(30)</sup>.

<sup>(28)</sup> There is also an implied link between the first two strophes, involving the Lord's "name". The psalmist has called upon himself to praise the Lord's "name", but that "name" is not merely an appellation. It is the character of God, proclaimed to Moses centuries earlier (Exod 34,6-7) and essentially repeated here (Ps 103,7-10).

<sup>(29)</sup> V.14 explains that the Lord can be loving, forgiving and merciful toward humans, even though they are not deserving of those things, because he realizes that people are "dust" (see n.32).

<sup>(30)</sup> The conjunction of sin and sickness or healing and forgiveness was widespread in the biblical world (e.g., Deut 28,15-19,27; Luke 5,17-26; John 9,2). See on this topic, G. VON RAD, *Old Testament Theology*, Vol. I (trans. D.M.G. Stalker) (New York 1962) 275. This does not, of course, deny the possibility that the psalm could have been used on other occasions, occasions when God's "love" and "mercy" were manifested in ways other than healing.

The fourth strophe (vv. 15-19) sets up a contrast between man's impermanence and the Lord's permanence as a way of proving that one can depend on the Lord to continue to display his loving and merciful character<sup>(31)</sup>. The theme of mankind's impermanence was introduced in v. 14, where it serves as a rationale for God's infinite love and mercy toward sinful man (see n. 29)<sup>(32)</sup>. Now, in the fourth strophe, this theme is picked up and used as proof of the impermanence — and, therefore, unreliability — of a man's love. He will die, and with him will die his love. This impermanence is stressed in order to contrast it to the permanence — and reliability — of God's love, a permanence which is guaranteed by the permanence of his universal sovereignty (v. 19)<sup>(33)</sup>. The Lord is a God of love and mercy, and, because his dominion is permanent, one can always rely on him to demonstrate his love and mercy toward the citizens of his kingdom.

The link between the fourth and fifth strophes is along similar lines. The idea of the Lord's permanent sovereignty, introduced at the conclusion of the fourth strophe (v. 19), is developed further in vv. 20-22. There is an almost imperceptible shift in thought, however, when one moves to these concluding verses. Whereas the permanence of the Lord's sovereignty has been emphasized in vv. 17-19, attention turns to the extent of the Lord's sovereignty in vv. 20-22. All beings under the Lord's sovereign control are to praise him. Based on the linkage to the preceding strophe (with its contrast between the impermanent and unreliable love of man and the permanent and reliable love of the Lord), it should be clear to the reader that the Lord is not being praised in this final strophe simply because of his

<sup>(31)</sup> One might outline vv. 6-19 according to the following past/present/future scheme: in vv. 6-10, the psalmist relates how the Lord revealed himself as a gracious and merciful God at the beginning of Israel's history; in vv. 11-14, the psalmist insists that the infinitude of this aspect of God's character is still in evidence at present; and in vv. 15-19, he reveals that God will continue to demonstrate the same qualities of love and mercy in the future, because he is sovereign.

<sup>(32)</sup> Because he realizes that man's sinfulness will not make a permanent blot on his holy creation, he can forgive that sin. This might reflect the theological rationale given for mankind's mortality, introduced in Gen 3,22-23. If Adam and Eve had been allowed to live forever, then sin — which they introduced to mankind — would also have become immortal. By mortalizing mankind, God mortalized the sin mankind commits. Also, to correct this mortal state and conquer death completely, sin would have to be conquered as well (see, for example, Rom 8,1-11).

<sup>(33)</sup> "Cette glorification du Dieu clément et miséricordieux se termine (v. 19) par l'affirmation que son amour — à la différence de l'amour humain — est lié à sa puissance ..." (DEISSLER, 130).

It would be easy for modern readers to miss some of the implications of the sentiment of this strophe. This is not simply a statement of the fact that humans are mortal. It is going beyond that to talk about covenant loyalty (*hesed*, here translated "steadfast love"). In the minds of the Israelites (and others of the ancient Near East), covenant loyalty between persons was thought of as permanent. The story of the covenant between David and Jonathan provides a good example. The terms of fidelity and loyalty that existed between those two men was to extend to their descendants as well (1 Sam 20,12-17; compare the use of the expression "bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh" — Gen 2,23; 2 Sam 5,1; 19,12). Yet, even the deepest and most solid of relationships is insignificant in comparison to the permanence and reliability of God's faithfulness to his covenant people.

lordship. Rather, he is praised because his subjects can always rely on him to be a loving, merciful, gracious and forgiving king. So, it is only natural that, in the final line, the psalmist should return to himself as one who can (and should) properly join with the rest of God's subjects in praising their king. The psalmist is a citizen of the Lord's kingdom who has personally turned to him for help and experienced proof that the Lord still lives up to his "name".

Before closing, it is necessary to pause at this point to address the commonly held view that this psalm develops along the lines of ever-expanding praise. Some describe this as a crescendo of praise, moving from the individual (vv. 1-5) to the nation of Israel (vv. 6-18)<sup>(34)</sup> to the entire universe (vv. 19-22)<sup>(35)</sup>. There is an obvious problem with this analysis, though: there is no mention of praise in vv. 6-18. Certainly, there is a broadening of horizons along the lines just outlined; but the motivation for this broadening is not to allow others into the praise. Instead, it is to encourage others in the covenant community to turn to God for help by reminding them that the Lord's actions on the psalmist's behalf are typical of the way God treats "all those who fear him".

As a final conclusion, then, I would argue that the intent of the psalm is not merely to provoke others to praise God. It is, more basically, hortatory or even evangelistic<sup>(36)</sup>. One purpose is to praise God for his mercy and love (vv. 1-2), which has been demonstrated in the life of the psalmist by some recent healing of disease (vv. 3-5). But by reminding his audience that this act accords with God's character as revealed centuries earlier (vv. 6-10), by describing the infinite completeness of God's love and mercy (vv. 11-14), and by proclaiming the permanent reliability of that love and mercy (vv. 15-19), the psalmist is encouraging others to put their trust in the Lord when they encounter similar hardships. Then, when he has answered them, they too, like the psalmist, will have firsthand proof of his love and mercy. Then they too will be able to join with the rest of the Lord's kingdom and genuinely "bless the Lord".

Religion Division  
Pepperdine University  
24255 Pacific Coast Highway  
Malibu, CA 90263 USA

T. M. WILLIS

<sup>(34)</sup> Some commentators divide the main section into two parts, with a movement from the covenant people to all mankind (so BARNES, 485-488; HENGSTENBERG, 224). This is untenable, however, because the humans considered throughout vv. 6-18 are the covenant people (see "those who fear him" in vv. 11.13.17; and "those who keep his covenant" in v. 18).

<sup>(35)</sup> So, for example, ALLEN, *Psalms 101-150*, 19; ANDERSON, 128-129; JENNINGS, 182-183; and SPURGEON, 447.

<sup>(36)</sup> Cp. K. SEYBOLD, *Das Gebet des Kranken im Alten Testament*. Untersuchungen zur Bestimmung und Zuordnung der Krankheits- und Heilungspsalmen (BWANT 5,19; Stuttgart 1973) 142-145.

## The Narrative Roles of the Women in Matthew's Genealogy

Why Matthew mentions the four OT women in his genealogy continues to intrigue interpreters<sup>(1)</sup>. Through a narrative-critical, reader-response approach we propose to shed new light on the roles played by these women. In contrast to previous explanations we will concentrate not only on the OT background but also on the narrative sequence and structural positions in which each of these women is placed as a key to demonstrating their significance for the genealogy as well as for the entire Matthean narrative.

### *Tamar (1,3)*

Tamar is the first woman mentioned in the list of ancestors (1,2-16) intended to substantiate the assertion in the superscription of the genealogy that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham (1,1)<sup>(2)</sup>. In the genealogical sequence Tamar as the mother is named in addition to Judah as the father of Perez and Zerah after the patriarchal series in which Abraham was the father of Isaac, Isaac the father of Jacob, and Jacob the father of Judah and his brothers (1,2). What is the Matthean implied reader, thoroughly familiar with the Jewish scriptures, to deduce from this intrusion of Tamar? What distinguishes Tamar from the matriarchs Sarah, Rebekah, Leah and Rachel so that she receives explicit mention while they do not?

From Gen 38 the reader knows that Tamar's union with Judah was rather unusual since she was not his wife but his widowed daughter-in-law. Judah had reneged on his promise to give Tamar, the widow of his first son, in marriage to his last son Shelah. So after the Canaanite wife of Judah died, Tamar disguised herself as a prostitute, seduced Judah, became pregnant by him and gave birth to the twins Perez and Zerah. Tamar merits

<sup>(1)</sup> For suggested solutions, see D. R. BAUER, "The Literary Function of the Genealogy in Matthew's Gospel", *SBLASP* 29 (1990) 461-463; W. D. DAVIES-D. C. ALLISON, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew: Volume I: Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I-VII* (ICC; Edinburgh 1988) 170-172; E. D. FREED, "The Women in Matthew's Genealogy", *JSNT* 29 (1987) 3-19; A. SAND, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (RNT; Regensburg 1986) 43-44; J. GNILKA, *Das Matthäusevangelium: Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1-13,58* (HTKNT 1/1; Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1986) 8-10; U. LUZ, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (EKKNT 1/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1985) 93-94; B. M. NOLAN, *The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1-2 in the Setting of the Gospel* (OBO 23; Göttingen 1979) 118-119; R. E. BROWN, *The Birth of the Messiah* (Garden City 1977) 71-74; M. D. JOHNSON, *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies with Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus* (SNTSMS 8; Cambridge 1969) 152-179.

<sup>(2)</sup> BAUER, "Genealogy", 456-457.

explicit mention in the genealogy because of her unique contribution to both the Abrahamic and the Davidic sonship of Jesus.

As the substitute for the Canaanite wife of Judah (Gen 38,2), Tamar advances the Abrahamic promises because she like Rebekah, Leah and Rachel was a non-Canaanite. At the end of his life Abraham made his servant solemnly swear "that you will not get a wife for my son from the daughters of the Canaanites, among whom I live, but will go to my country and to my kindred and get a wife for my son Isaac" (Gen 24,3-4). The servant then traveled to Aram-naharaim (Gen 24,10) and procured Rebekah. Isaac in turn charged Jacob, "You shall not marry one of the Canaanite women" (Gen 28,1). He then sent Jacob to Paddan-aram, to the ancestral home and kindred of Abraham, where he obtained Leah and Rachel, who became the mothers of "Judah and his brothers" (1,2)<sup>(3)</sup>. By marrying non-Canaanites Jacob assures the continuation of God's promises to Abraham as Isaac adds: "May God Almighty bless you and make you fruitful and numerous, that you may become a company of peoples. May he give to you the blessing of Abraham, to you and to your offspring with you, so that you may take possession of the land where you now live as an alien—land that God gave to Abraham" (Gen 28,3-4).

Although the biblical account is vague about Tamar's ancestry, according to pre-Christian Jewish traditions in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Book of Jubilees she was a daughter of Aram<sup>(4)</sup>. Not only was she from the homeland of Abraham like Rebekah, Leah and Rachel, but her non-Canaanite origin is emphasized as the reason she is rejected by the sons and the Canaanite wife of Judah (*T. Jud.* 10; *Jub.* 42,1-7). By explicitly naming her Matthew reminds the reader that Judah continued the Abrahamic line not by his Canaanite wife but by the non-Canaanite Aramean, Tamar. The structural position of her being the only one in the genealogy named as the mother of two sons, Perez and Zerah (1,3), after the notice of a plurality of descendants, "Judah and his brothers" (1,2), confirms Tamar's unique role in furthering God's promise that Abraham would have numerous descendants (Gen 12,1-3; 15,5; 17,5-6).

But there is also a Davidic aspect to Tamar. Judah was distinguished as the preeminent ancestor of the Davidic dynasty (Gen 49,9-10; *T. Jud.* 17,5-6; 21,2; 22; 24,5-6). Matthew has incorporated into his genealogy (1,3-5) the tradition found in Ruth 4,12.18-22 that the birth of Perez to Judah by Tamar begins the line of direct descent to David. Later in the infancy narrative Matthew emphasizes that Judah is the origin of the Messianic Davidic king as he adds "land of Judah" to his combined quotation of Mic 5,1 and 2 Sam 5,2: "And you, Bethlehem, land of Judah, are by no means least among the leaders of Judah; for from you will come a leader, who will shepherd my people Israel" (2,6)<sup>(5)</sup>. When Judah realized

<sup>(3)</sup> Aram-naharaim and Paddan-aram refer to the same region, the ancestral home of Abraham; see *NRSV* on Gen 11,31.

<sup>(4)</sup> On the second century BC dating of these documents, see *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. CHARLESWORTH) (Garden City 1983; 1985) 1.777-778; 2.43-44.

<sup>(5)</sup> DAVIES-ALLISON, *Matthew*, 1.242.

that his widowed daughter-in-law Tamar had become pregnant by him, he acknowledged that "she is more in the right than I, since I did not give her to my son Shelah" (Gen 38,26). Pre-Christian Jewish traditions elaborate upon Judah's sinfulness in relation to Tamar. In *T. Jud.* 14,5 Judah confesses that "before the eyes of all I turned aside to Tamar and committed a great sin". And in *Jub.* 41,23 "Judah knew that the deed which he did was evil because he lay with his daughter-in-law". The explicit mention of Tamar, then, reminds the reader that sinfulness was connected with the Davidic kingship from its very beginning with Judah.

### *Rahab and Ruth (1,5)*

The second and third women within the genealogical sequence — Rahab and Ruth — are coupled by their appearance in successive generations (1,5) as well as by the alliteration of their names. Together they advance the Abrahamic and Davidic dimensions of the genealogy.

First, the mention of Rahab, the Canaanite prostitute of Jericho<sup>(6)</sup>, who hid the Israelite spies in her house, signals the fulfillment of the promise that the numerous descendants of Abraham would take possession of the land of Canaan (Gen 28,3-4)<sup>(7)</sup>. In Josh 2,9 she tells the Israelites, "I know that the Lord has given you the land". The inclusion of the Canaanite Rahab in the line of Abrahamic descent also marks the beginning of the fulfillment of the universalist promise that all the peoples of the earth would be blessed in Abraham (Gen 12,3), whom God made the father of a multitude of nations (Gen 17,5). As a Canaanite in contrast to the non-Canaanite Tamar and the previous non-Canaanite matriarchs, Rahab begins a notable transition in the genealogy from Jewish to Gentile women. She is inserted as a first example of a Gentile with faith in the God of Israel. In Josh 2,11 she acknowledged to the Israelites, "The Lord your God is indeed God in heaven above and on earth below". Her faith enabled not only her but her family and all who belonged to her to continue to live in the land of Israel and thus to share in the Abrahamic promises (Josh 6,25)<sup>(8)</sup>.

As a Moabite following the Canaanite Rahab, Ruth reinforces the inclusive, universalist dimension of the Abrahamic promises. Like Rahab she attaches herself to the people and God of Israel by her faith. When Naomi, the Jewish mother-in-law of Ruth, urges her to return to her Moabite people and gods, Ruth proclaims her faith: "Where you go, I will go; where you lodge, I will lodge; your people shall be my people, and your God my God" (Ruth 1,16). The Abrahamic role of Ruth is confirmed

<sup>(6)</sup> For refutation of the possibility that this Rahab is not the Canaanite prostitute in Joshua, see R. E. BROWN, "Rahab in Mt 1,5 Probably is Rahab of Jericho", *Bib* 63 (1982) 79-80; DAVIES-ALLISON, *Matthew*, 1.172-173.

<sup>(7)</sup> GNILKA, *Matthäusevangelium*, 1.9.

<sup>(8)</sup> The faith of Rahab was renowned in Christian tradition; see Heb 11,31; Jas 2,25; A. T. HANSON, "Rahab the Harlot in Early Christian Tradition", *JSNT* 1 (1978) 53-60.



when those who witness Boaz's acquisition of her as his wife declare: "May the Lord make the woman who is coming into your house like Rachel and Leah, who together built up the house of Israel" (Ruth 4,11).

The Davidic character of Rahab and Ruth emerges from the contrast between their sinless unions with their legitimate husbands and the sinful union of Tamar with Judah. Although Rahab was known as a "prostitute" (Josh 2,1), there is no indication that her marriage with Salmon, which is not even recounted in the biblical tradition, was in any way sinful. Rather, according to Matthew, she was the mother of Boaz, who eventually became the husband of Ruth. Whereas the shameful union of Judah with his widowed daughter-in-law Tamar reveals his sinfulness, Boaz is praised for marrying Ruth, the widowed daughter-in-law of Naomi. The people and elders of Bethlehem tell Boaz of their hope that his marriage will fittingly continue the Davidic line begun with Judah: "Through the children that the Lord will give you by this young woman, may your house be like the house of Perez, whom Tamar bore to Judah" (Ruth 4,12). After Ruth gave birth to Obed, the grandfather of David (Ruth 4,17), the hopeful excitement continues as the women of Bethlehem exclaim to Naomi: "May his name be renowned in Israel! He shall be to you a restorer of life and a nourisher of your old age" (Ruth 4,14-15). The sinless unions of Rahab and Ruth, then, offset the sinful union of Tamar. After being alerted to the failure of Judah with the mention of Tamar, the reader is given hope for the Davidic line by the mention of Rahab as the mother of the admirable Boaz and of Ruth as the wife of Boaz and the mother of the promising Obed.

### *The Wife of Uriah (1,6)*

After the climactic notice of the birth of David "the king" the fourth woman appears: "David was the father of Solomon by the wife of Uriah" (1,6). The designation "by the wife of Uriah" (ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Οὐρίου) rather than "by Bathsheba" underlines the sinfulness of David, as it recalls not only his adultery but his murder of Uriah (2 Sam 12,9). David's wicked deeds stand in contrast to his ancestors' exemplary deeds as recalled by Rahab and Ruth and continue the sinfulness introduced by his ancestor Judah as recalled by Tamar.

These transgressions of David were destined to have devastating consequences for his descendants. As the prophet Nathan tells him: "Now therefore the sword shall never depart from your house, for you have despised me, and have taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be your wife. Thus says the Lord: I will raise up trouble against you from within your own house" (2 Sam 12,10-11). David's sinful union with the wife of Uriah repeats and intensifies that of his premier ancestor Judah, who in *T. Jud.* 17,1-3 predicted its tragic effects:

And now, my children, I command you not to love money or to gaze on the beauty of women (see 2 Sam 11,2). Because it was on account of money and attractive appearance that I was led astray to Bathshua

the Canaanite. And I know that on account of these two things my tribe is doomed to wickedness. For even the wise men from among my sons will be changed for the worse, and the kingdom of Judah they shall cause to be diminished.

Indeed, the wickedness initiated by Judah and extended by king David and the succeeding sons of David ultimately resulted in the disastrous Babylonian exile for "Jechoniah and his brothers" (1,11).

At the beginning of the genealogy hopefulness was generated for the reader by what the selection of Judah as the ancestor of the Davidic kingship might mean for the rest of "his brothers" (1,2), representative of the people of Israel<sup>(9)</sup>. After the pessimistic reminder of Judah's sin with Tamar (1,3) this hope was rekindled by the inspiring models of faith, Rahab and Ruth (1,5). But the notice of David's sinfulness with the wife of Uriah (1,6), which eventually leads to the destructive deportation to Babylon of Jechoniah and "his brothers" (1,11), the people of Israel, drastically darkens this hope. After the genealogy reached a zenith with the birth of David the king (1,6), it tumbled to a nadir with the exile of king Jechoniah and his brothers (1,11.17).

*Joseph the Husband of Mary (1,16)*

But the genealogy attains its apex with the appearance of the fifth and final woman: "Jacob was the father of Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ" (1,16). That Joseph was "the husband of Mary" (τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας) directly contrasts him with David, who was not the husband of Bathsheba, "the wife of Uriah" (1,6), and with Judah, who was not the husband but the father-in-law of Tamar. His proper marriage with Mary stands in continuity with the proper marriages of Rahab and Ruth (1,5). The reader can expect Joseph to distance himself from the sinfulness of David and Judah and to associate himself with the faithfulness of Rahab and Ruth.

The surprising and climactic way that Mary is introduced indicates how she complements the four previous women. That Mary's motherhood is expressed with the Greek preposition ἐκ places her motherhood in continuity with that of Tamar, Rahab, Ruth and the wife of Uriah. But according to the pattern that "Judah was the father of Perez and Zerah by Tamar (ἐκ τῆς Θαμάρ)", "Salmon was the father of Boaz by Rahab (ἐκ τῆς Ραχάβ)", "Boaz was the father of Obed by Ruth (ἐκ τῆς Ρούθ)", and "David was the father of Solomon by the wife of Uriah (ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Οὐρίου)", we expect to hear that "Joseph was the father of Jesus by Mary". Instead we hear that "Joseph was the husband of Mary, of whom (ἐξ ἧς) was born Jesus who is called Christ". This dramatic break in the pattern indicates how the role of Mary greatly surpasses that of the previous women<sup>(10)</sup>. Whereas they are unique instruments in Jesus

<sup>(9)</sup> BAUER, "Genealogy", 459-460.

<sup>(10)</sup> DAVIES-ALLISON, *Matthew*, 1.183-184.

becoming the Son of David and Son of Abraham, Mary is the extraordinary instrument in Jesus becoming the Christ (1,1). Whereas Tamar and the wife of Uriah point to the sinfulness inherent in the Davidic kingship, Mary gives birth to the Davidic Christ, who will reverse and eliminate this sinfulness. And Mary's giving birth to the Davidic Christ will continue Rahab's and Ruth's fulfillment of the universalist promise of Abraham.

Although Mary conceived Jesus by the divine agency of the Holy Spirit (1,18), Joseph officially bestows upon him his Davidic status. Addressed by the angel of the Lord as "son of David" (1,20), Joseph is directed to name the son to be born of Mary "Jesus, for he will save his people from their sins" (1,21). By obediently accepting Mary as his wife and naming Jesus, Joseph follows the models of faithfulness provided by Rahab and Ruth. He establishes Jesus as the Davidic Christ, who will deliver the people of Israel from the sinfulness introduced by the previous Davidic kings, as signaled by Tamar and the wife of Uriah. Born of Mary and named by Joseph, Jesus will save his people from their sins as the Davidic Christ, the newborn King, who in contrast to previous kings truly "will shepherd my people Israel" (2,6). As the Messianic Son of David Jesus goes on to eradicate the sinfulness of the previous Davidic kingship by his teaching of mercy and forgiveness (5,21-26; 6,12-15; 9,9-13; 18,21-35) and by his healing people as an actualization of divine forgiveness (9,1-8)<sup>(11)</sup>. When he is addressed as "Son of David", it is always in a context of his healing activity (9,27; 12,23; 15,22; 20,30-31; 21,9.15). His death establishes the covenant that effects the universal forgiveness of sins (26,28).

It is as the Messianic Son of David, made possible by the proper marriage of Joseph and Mary, that Jesus illustrates in what sense he is the Son of Abraham (1,1). He continues the fulfillment of the inclusive, universalist promise of Abraham begun by the proper marriages of the Gentile women Rahab and Ruth. His birth by Mary as the Christ and newborn King of the Jews draws Gentile magi from the east, who pay homage to "the child with Mary his mother" (2,11) in contrast to King Herod and the Jewish leaders (2,1-12). Before Jesus' baptism John the Baptist warns the Pharisees and Sadducees who would rely upon their exclusive Abrahamic sonship that "God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham" (3,9). After contrasting the outstanding faith of a Gentile centurion who seeks healing for his servant with the faith of those in Israel (8,5-10), Jesus utters the shocking proclamation that faithful Gentiles will be included in the eschatological banquet and unfaithful Jews excluded: "Many from the east and the west will come and recline with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, but the children of the kingdom will be driven out" (8,11-12).

Especially noteworthy is how Rahab and Ruth foreshadow the Davidic Christ's fulfillment of the Abrahamic promise when he heals the daughter of a Gentile woman (15,21-28). Like Rahab this woman is a Canaanite. She begs for her daughter's healing by addressing Jesus as "Son of David"

<sup>(11)</sup> J.P. HEIL, "Significant Aspects of the Healing Miracles in Matthew", *CBQ* 41 (1979) 274-287.

(15,22). Jesus replies to this Gentile with the restriction, "I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (15,24; see 10,5-6). But the woman's persistence begins to loosen this restriction, opening the way to a further fulfillment of the inclusive, universalist promise of Abraham. To Jesus' gruff reluctance to take the "bread" of the children (of Israel) and throw it to the dogs (Gentiles) she cleverly counters that even the dogs eat the scraps that fall from the table of their masters (15,26-27). Her "great faith" breaks through the barrier excluding Gentiles and wins healing for her daughter (15,28) in much the same way as the great faith of Rahab and Ruth, the Gentile women ancestors of the Son of David, enabled them to share in the Abrahamic promises.

The death and resurrection of Jesus bring his character as the Messianic Son of Abraham who induces the faith of Gentiles to its culmination. When the Gentile centurion and those with him see the earthquake and the spectacular resurrection of the saints that takes place at the death of Jesus, they proclaim their faith that "truly this was the Son of God!" (27,51-54), which serves as *the* climactic confession of the entire narrative (see 3,17; 14,33; 16,16; 17,5; 26,63-64)<sup>(12)</sup>. In the final scene of the narrative the risen Jesus transcends the limitation placed on the disciples to "go" (πορεύεσθε) only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (10,6) by authorizing them to "go" (πορευθέντες) and make disciples of all peoples (28,19). According to his description of the last judgment (25,31-46) Jesus will judge "all peoples" like a shepherd, who separates the sheep on his right from the goats on his left. This enlarges the previous uses of the shepherd metaphor in Matthew. Now the sheep are not limited to the people of Israel (2,6; 9,36; 10,6; 15,24), the disciples (10,16), or believers (18,12-14) but include the righteous among all peoples. In authorizing his disciples to make disciples of "all peoples" (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, 28,19) Jesus is thereby empowering them not only to become but to enable "all peoples" (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, 25,32), who will be gathered before Jesus as the shepherd at the last judgment, to become the righteous sheep blessed with eternal life rather than the goats doomed to punishment (25,31-46).

### Conclusion

Most previous attempts to explain the roles of the women in Matthew's genealogy have overestimated what they all have in common and underestimated their differences. By taking seriously not only their biblical backgrounds but their respective structural positions and the sequence in which the implied reader experiences their naming, we have illustrated the dynamic interrelationship of both their similarities and differences. We may summarize the distinctive narrative roles that these women play in demonstrating how Jesus is the Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham (1,1), as follows.

<sup>(12)</sup> J. P. HEIL, *The Death and Resurrection of Jesus: A Narrative-Critical Reading of Matthew 26-28* (Minneapolis 1991) 87-88.

The mention of Tamar (1,3) underlines the improper but Abrahamic marital union between her and her father-in-law Judah. She reminds the reader that sinfulness was inherent to the Davidic kingship from its very beginning with Judah, the premier Davidic ancestor. In contrast to Tamar, Rahab and Ruth (1,5) are paired as Gentile women of stellar faith in proper and Abrahamic marital unions with praiseworthy ancestors of David. They inspire the implied reader's hope for a sinless Davidic king, who will fulfill the inclusive, universalist promises of Abraham. But the reference to the wife of Uriah (1,6) dims this hope as it recalls her improper union with an adulterous and murderous king David. As a direct reversal of the Abrahamic ideal of drawing Gentiles to faith, David's egregious sinfulness dooms the people of Israel to a disastrous deportation to the foreign land of Babylon (1,11). This tragedy is reversed, however, by the fifth and final woman, Mary (1,16). Although in a proper marital union with Joseph, she gives birth through a divine conception to Jesus, the Christ, who stands as the apex of Matthew's salvation-historical genealogy. His birth by Mary and naming by Joseph establish him not only as the Messianic Son of David, who saves his people from the sinfulness exemplified by the previous Davidic kings as recalled by Tamar and the wife of Uriah, but also as the Messianic Son of Abraham, who fulfills the universalist hope inspired by Rahab and Ruth as he opens the kingdom of God to all peoples.

Kenrick-Glennon Seminary  
St. Louis, Missouri 63119-4399 USA

John Paul HEIL

## The Use of *συκοφαντεῖν* in Luke 19,8: Further Evidence for Zacchaeus's Defense

One problem for the interpretation of Luke 19,8 as Zacchaeus's defense arises from the difficulty of understanding the meaning of καὶ εἴ τινός τι ἐσυκοφάντησα ἀποδίδωμι τετραπλοῦν<sup>(1)</sup>. Some commentators believe the use of *συκοφαντεῖν* points to deliberate behavior, from which Zacchaeus has repented<sup>(2)</sup>. This contributes to interpreting verse 8 as a statement of future resolve, rather than as a defense of his customary behavior. My article in this journal argued differently, that *συκοφαντεῖν* could refer to an unintentional act<sup>(3)</sup>. When Zacchaeus discovered he had done this, he customarily made a fourfold restitution. Thus the use of *συκοφαντεῖν* need not indicate an intentional act, for which Zacchaeus repented. It could simply refer to a common charge made against toll collectors in Luke's day, which, in the story, Zacchaeus's critics leveled against him. His response is intended to clarify: if, on occasion, he is guilty of unintentional overcharging, incorrect assessment, or false accusation, he usually makes ample return for his mistake<sup>(4)</sup>. I should like to present further evidence for interpreting *συκοφαντεῖν* in Luke 19,8 to mean something unintentional. This will help to clarify why the verse should be taken as Zacchaeus's defense against the false charges of his critics.

*Συκοφαντεῖν* means to extort or to defraud by false charges, but there are plenty of examples where it means to quibble or to misrepresent<sup>(5)</sup>. So it need not refer to a deliberate act. Moreover, εἴ τινός τι ἐσυκοφάντησα is

(1) "...and if I have falsely accused anyone of anything, I pay back four times as much" (translation mine).

(2) C. F. EVANS, *Saint Luke* (London-Philadelphia 1990) 661, 663; D. W. CLEVERLEY FORD, *A Reading of Saint Luke's Gospel* (London 1967) 201; D. HAMM, "Luke 19,8 Once Again: Does Zacchaeus Defend or Resolve?", *JBL* 107 (1988) 434; N. M. WATSON, "Was Zacchaeus Really Reforming?", *ExpTim* 77 (1965-66) 282-283; I. H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke* (NIGT; Grand Rapids 1979) 698; J. O'HANLON, "The Story of Zacchaeus and the Lukan Ethic", *JSNT* 12 (1981) 3; A. PLUMMER, *The Gospel According to Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh 1908) 435.

(3) "Zacchaeus Revisited: Luke 19,8 as a Defense", *Bib* 71 (1990) 153-176. Also see F. GODET, *Commentaire sur L'Évangile de Saint Luc*, vol.2 (Paris 1889) 337-338; J. A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV* (AB 28A; Garden City 1985) 1225; A. S. RAVENS, "Zacchaeus: The Final Part of a Lucan Triptych?", *JSNT* 41 (1991) 27.

(4) D. HAMM, "Zacchaeus Revisited Once More: A Story of Vindication or Conversion?", *Bib* 72 (1991) 249, believes this interpretation necessarily involves Zacchaeus in a contradiction: that he could defend his usual just behavior and admit to occasional errors that require restitution.

(5) Plutarch, *Pomp.* 2.5; *Alex.* 74.5; *Cat. Min.* 11.4; *Quom. adul.* 73B; *Quaest. Rom.* 269D; *De Pyth. orac.* 407F, 409C; *De vit. pud.* 529D; *De invid. et od.* 538A; *Cons. ad uxor.* 611A-B; *Quaest. Conv.* 707F; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Isaeus* 8.26,

a simple condition, which could refer to something already said about Zacchaeus, namely that he has falsely charged people in tax matters<sup>(c)</sup>. It must be remembered that the murmuring crowd accused Zacchaeus of being a sinner (19,7). Yet, they do not specify the grounds of their accusation; so it appears that they judge him on the basis of his profession alone and fail to consider anything beyond that. Thus, his response provides a clue to the charge. The story line shows that they believe he has falsely accused others, or defrauded them in some way. This belief comes from their perception of him as a toll collector. In response, he makes a defense which describes his customary activity of restitution, when he makes a mistake. If one wonders how Zacchaeus could have erred unintentionally, two examples from Josephus are instructive.

In *Ant.* 16.6.5 §170, the letter of Marcus Agrippa to the council and people of Cyrene is reproduced. Agrippa is resolving a dispute, in which the Jews there were prevented from sending monies to Jerusalem because certain individuals accused them of owing taxes, which actually were not owed. The people who leveled the charge are called συκοφάνται. Because the accusation was unfounded, Agrippa ordered the money to be restored to the Jews of Cyrene.

In *Ant.* 10.7.3 §114-115, Josephus tells the story of Jeremiah, who, when he returned to his home village of Anathoth, was arrested by a magistrate, who falsely accused (συκοφαντῶν) him of desertion to the Babylonians. Jeremiah countered the charge, but the magistrate did not believe him and brought him to trial before other magistrates, who punished him unjustly. The value of the story lies in the process of accusation, defense, and resolution of the conflict.

Taken together these examples provide clues to what Zacchaeus refers to in his own defense. As a toll collector, he may have occasionally overcharged someone for taxes due, or falsely accused a person with delinquency in tax payment. When the mistake was discovered, or when they answered his charge and provided an adequate defense, perhaps before a magistrate, Zacchaeus acknowledged his error. In such a case he customarily made the fourfold restitution he speaks about. It is quite reasonable and not at all contradictory, then, for Zacchaeus to be righteous, as his name indicates, and to admit that he made some mistakes in the exercise of his office, which he then rectified.

Theology Department  
Georgetown University  
Washington, D.C. 20057-0998 USA

Alan C. MITCHELL, S.J.

8.32; *Dem.* 34.29, 35.19, 49.9, 55.1, 56.31; *Thuc.* 2.18; 34.30; Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl. hist.* 1.92.5; Philo Judaeus, *De cherub.* 37; *De Plant.* 72; *De Jos.* 196-198, 207-209, 236, 244, 270.

<sup>(c)</sup> On the simple condition as a response to something said, believed, or assumed see F. BLASS, A. DEBRUNNER, and R. FUNK, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago 1961) §372, M. ZERWICK, *Biblical Greek* (Rome 1963) §306, and A. T. ROBERTSON, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in Light of Historical Research* (New York 1914) 1008.

## The Israelite Vow: Distress or Daily Life?

### *The Distress Hypothesis*

Students of the Israelite vow (OT, נדר) have almost unanimously averred that this particular religious practice was initiated either primarily or solely in moments of extreme distress, psychological anxiety or preternatural pressure. This "distress hypothesis" (as I have labeled it) has been evinced in some of the most important contributions on the Israelite and northwest Semitic votive system. In his *The Pre-Biblical Narrative Tradition: Essays on the Ugaritic Poems Keret and Aqhat*, for example, Simon Parker observes:

It is characteristic of the vow that it is used in situations of anxiety .... People may be so anxious, disturbed or desperate about their situation that they are willing to promise to sacrifice to the deity something really precious in return for relief<sup>(1)</sup>.

This quote furnishes us with the most recent attestation of a view which surfaces abundantly in the relevant scholarly literature<sup>(2)</sup>. Accordingly, it is almost everywhere maintained that the vow was invoked solely or primarily in "kritischen Lagen"<sup>(3)</sup>, "when in great danger or on the bed of sickness"<sup>(4)</sup>, "in times of peril or distress"<sup>(5)</sup>, "une situation difficile"<sup>(6)</sup>, or "moments of crisis"<sup>(7)</sup>.

In support of this conclusion proponents of this hypothesis have accurately noted that both the vow of Jephthah (Judg 11,30-31) as well as that of the besieged Israelites (Num 21,2) were made in situations of

<sup>(1)</sup> S. PARKER, *The Pre-Biblical Narrative Tradition: Essays on the Ugaritic Poems Keret and Aqhat* (SBLSPS 24; Atlanta 1989) 84. Similarly, T. Cartledge notes: "The worshiper, in a time of some distress, seeks God's help and promises to pay him for it"; T. CARTLEDGE, "Were Nazirite Vows Unconditional?", *CBQ* 51 (1989) 415. Also see T. CARTLEDGE, "Vow", *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* IV, 998.

<sup>(2)</sup> It must also be recalled that to this point there is no recognition that such a "distress hypothesis" exists. The basic arguments in favor of this theory have yet to be questioned or critically evaluated.

<sup>(3)</sup> A. KNOBEL, *Die Genesis* (EHAT 11; Leipzig 1852) 215.

<sup>(4)</sup> B. WEISS, *New Translation and Exposition of the Book of Ecclesiastes With Critical Notes on the Hebrew Text* (Edinburgh 1858) 193.

<sup>(5)</sup> A.S. PEAKE, "Vow", *A Dictionary of the Bible* (ed. J. HASTINGS) (Edinburgh 1905) IV, 872-873.

<sup>(6)</sup> C. BREKELMANS-J. GOLDSTAIN, "Vœu", *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique de la Bible*, 1343.

<sup>(7)</sup> J. MILGROM, *Numbers במדבר: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (The JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia 1990) 251.



military conflict. In Gen 28,20-22 Jacob, while attempting to escape the wrath of his brother, is similarly portrayed as making a vow in a moment of undeniable difficulty<sup>(8)</sup>.

It has also been argued, quite plausibly, that the occasionally witnessed vow for offspring (1 Sam 1,11), or the means to continue one's line (i.e., Keret's vow for Lady Hurriya)<sup>(9)</sup>, was initiated in circumstances of heightened psychological anxiety. Here again, the distress hypothesis has reasonably concluded that the procuring of progeny assumes a great degree of economic, social and religious significance for the would-be progenitor and consequently is of great concern<sup>(10)</sup>.

The Psalms also provide forthright testimony to the practice of making vows in moments of distress. In Pss 22; 50; 56; 61; 66 and 116 we receive stirring descriptions of supplicants who have endured particularly traumatic life and death situations upon uttering their vows.

As such, there is little reason to doubt that the Old Testament authors know of individuals who make vows under circumstances of distress. It will be suggested below, however, that the distress hypothesis has offered a highly constricted assessment of the types of conditions which may have prompted the Israelite Homo Religiosus to engage in this behavior. In this paper it will be argued that the biblical sources, as well as one Ammonite inscription in particular, faintly preserve the substratum of an entirely different form of votive praxis.

### *Implications and Contradictions*

The distress hypothesis has done an admirable job in its presentation and analysis of the data cited above. However, proponents of this view have refrained from elaborating upon the theoretical ramifications of their findings. One issue which has heretofore remained undiscussed concerns the *frequency* by which suppliants would make vows in ancient Israel. An examination of this issue will greatly assist us in identifying some of the prevailing deficiencies of this theory.

<sup>(8)</sup> A Punic inscription testifies to the votive offering of a suppliant who has been healed by the deity (*KAI* 66). These "health" vows may also be considered to have been made in circumstances of distress and/or psychological anxiety. Unfortunately, the majority of texts in our voluminous corpus of Punic and Phoenician votive inscriptions almost never articulate the conditions under which the vow was made.

<sup>(9)</sup> *KTU* 1.14.4, 35-43.

<sup>(10)</sup> On the desirability of children in Israel and Mesopotamia see J.J.M. ROBERTS, "Divine Freedom and Cultic Manipulation in Israel and Mesopotamia", *Unity and Diversity: Essays in the History, Literature, and Religion of the Ancient Near East* (eds. H. GOEDICKE-J.J.M. ROBERTS) (Baltimore 1975) 182; S.D. SPERLING, "KAI 24 Re-examined", *UF* 20 (1988) 336-337; R. ALBERTZ, *Persönliche Frömmigkeit und Offizielle Religion: Religionsinterner Pluralismus in Israel und Babylon* (Calwer Theologische Monographien 9; Stuttgart 1978) 51, writes "Die Geburt eines Kindes ist neben Hochzeit und Beerdigung eines der zentralen Ereignisse im Leben der Familie". The most poignant testimony to the social and economic importance of children can be detected in the description of Danel's misery at the beginning of the *AQHT* epic (*KTU* 1.17; also see Num 27,4; 2 Sam 18,18).

Simon Parker has delineated five different circumstances in which vows are seen to be made in Israelite, Ugaritic and Hittite literature. Among these he lists vows made for the health of the king, the securing of progeny, the defeat of enemies, "deliverance from attack and siege ... and safe return from abroad ..." <sup>(11)</sup>.

Yet, if we were to accept such a view we would also have to concede the following proposition: the making of vows was not a mundane, quotidian transaction. This is due to the fact that none of these circumstances typically confront the *Homo Religiosus* with tremendous frequency in her/his daily life.

Warfare, though recurrent in the history of a society, is an uncommon — and certainly not an everyday — occurrence within the course of an individual lifetime. While many human beings will find occasion to have children, such a circumstance occurs relatively infrequently <sup>(12)</sup>. For that matter, it is reasonable to assume that many Israelites never had the luxury to vow for safe return from abroad or had the necessity (or perhaps the desire?) to supplicate Yahweh on behalf of the king.

Thus, a logical corollary of the distress hypothesis — one never articulated by adherents of this position — should be that vows were not, and could not, be made on a daily or *even a regular basis*. Quite the contrary: the circumstances that engender a vow should arise unpredictably, in response to the most traumatic and taxing moments of one's life. The incubation of a vow occurs, so to speak, only when the barn is burning.

### *The Non-Distress Hypothesis*

Yet, this theoretically-derived implication of infrequent, sporadic votive activity would seem to contradict the evidence yielded by some of our north-west Semitic sources. As Oesterley and Rowley have noted: "Vows were clearly of very common occurrence in Israel ..." <sup>(13)</sup>. The most direct testimony to the accuracy of this observation can be identified in the repeated admonitions of the biblical author concerning the importance of fulfilling vows.

<sup>(11)</sup> PARKER, *The Pre-Biblical Narrative Tradition*, 86.

<sup>(12)</sup> Although statistics for the rate of childbirth in ancient Israel are not readily available, we may safely estimate that even in the most extreme cases, "progeny vows" would be made no more than a dozen or so times in the average lifespan. However, as I have shown elsewhere, it is perfectly reasonable to assume that various distress vows could be made every day — especially if the suppliant perceives that they have not been granted. An infertile woman could conceivably vow everyday of her life, but to no avail. See the author's doctoral dissertation, *The Israelite Vow and the So-Called "Popular Religion": A Sociological and Philological Investigation* (New York University, 1991; Forthcoming from University Microfilms, Ann Arbor) 256-258.

<sup>(13)</sup> W.O.E. OESTERLEY-H.H. ROWLEY, "Vows", *Dictionary of the Bible* (2nd ed.) 1025. In a similar vein, Sturdy opines: "Such vows must have been a common feature of life for the Israelites for them to be given as much attention as they are in the Old Testament ..." J. STURDY, *Numbers* (The Cambridge Bible Commentary; Cambridge 1976) 209; Also see J. PEDERSEN, *Israel: Its Life and Culture* (London 1963) III-IV, 325; and G.A. SMITH, *The Book of Deuteronomy: In the Revised Version with Introduction and Notes* (The Cambridge Bible For Schools and Colleges; Cambridge 1950) 275.

Apparently, some Israelites seem to have displayed a certain forgetfulness in compensating their benefactor. Thus, passages, such as Num 30,3; Deut 23,22-24; Qoh 5,3-6 and Prov 20,25, attest to frustration with unscrupulous supplicants. For in these verses the authors *actually recommend restraint* when it comes to making vows — as if suggesting that too many vows are being made (<sup>14</sup>).

If we were to follow the distress hypothesis however, we would be forced to assert that vows were primarily made in situations of tremendous gravity. Yet the authors of Qoh 5,4 and Deut 23,23 remind their audience that it is better not to vow at all, than to make a vow and not to fulfil it. The tone of these passages suggests that vows are made frequently, even superfluously by Israelite suppliants. Is it plausible to assume that the authors are reprimanding their readers for making too many vows in moments of crisis?

This question — to be answered in the negative — leads us to search for further instances in which vows assume the status of a commonplace, recurrent religious practice. One such case is a seventh-century (<sup>15</sup>) Ammonite inscription (<sup>16</sup>), which reads:

- |         |   |                  |
|---------|---|------------------|
| 1) ...) | Abinadab who made a vow                 | אבנדר ש (17) נדר |
| 2)      | to As[ta]rte-in-Sidon ( <sup>18</sup> ) | ר לעשת בצדן      |
| 3)      | may she bless him.                      | חברכה            |

(<sup>14</sup>) See in particular Deut 23,23, Qoh 5,4, and Prov 20,25. Nowack was perhaps the first to realize this: "Jedenfalls ist es ein Zeichen gesunden religiösen Sinnes, wenn das Deut. 23,22, vgl. Koh. 5,4, ausdrücklich darauf aufmerksam macht, dass das Nichtgeloben keine Sünde sei". W. NOWACK, *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Archäologie* (Sammlung Theologischer Lehrbücher; Freiburg i.B. und Leipzig 1894) II, 264.

(<sup>15</sup>) A seventh-century date was originally ascribed to this text by N. AVIGAD, "Two Phoenician Votive Seals", *IEJ* 16 (1966) 248, on the basis of the use of the relative pronoun ש. D. SIVAN, "On the Grammar and Orthography of the Ammonite Findings", *UF* 14 (1982) 229, arrives at a similar conclusion.

(<sup>16</sup>) In his original publication of this text (variously referred to as AS 49 in K. JACKSON, *The Ammonite Language of the Iron Age* [HSM 27; California 1983] or #56 in W. AUFRECHT, *A Corpus of Ammonite Inscriptions* [Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies 4; Lewiston 1989] or VSF 82 in F. ISRAEL, "Les Sceaux Ammonites", *Syria* 64 [1987] 143) Avigad identified the text in question as Phoenician. Over some initial objections (W. FULCO, Review of *The Ammonite Language of the Iron Age* by Kent Jackson, in *CBQ* 48 [1986] 535-536) scholars have steadily identified this inscription as Ammonite. G. Garbini was the first to break with Avigad's position (G. GARBINI, "Ammonite Inscriptions", *JSS* 19 [1974] 165), and by 1979, P. BORDREUIL-A. LEMAIRE, "Nouveau Groupe de Sceaux Hébreux, Araméens et Ammonites (Planches 3 et 4)", *Sem* 29 (1979) 71-84, had made this identification all but official.

(<sup>17</sup>) AVIGAD, "Two Phoenician Votive Seals", compared ש נדר to Ph. and Pn אש נדר, though he was then laboring under the assumption that this inscription was Phoenician (248). JACKSON, *The Ammonite Language*, 78, refutes this point and focuses on the differences between ש and אש as a major means of proving that this inscription is in fact Ammonite and not Phoenician.

(<sup>18</sup>) BORDREUIL-LEMAIRE, "Nouveau Groupe", have opined that this vow was perhaps not made in Sidon: "Si on admet que l'inscription de ce sceau est ammonite, il s'ensuit qu'il a dû être gravé, non pas à Sidon, mais dans la région d'Amman.

In spite of its rather prosaic contents, this inscription serves to call into question the correlation drawn between distress and votive activity. N. Avi-gad, who was the first to publish this text, has offered the following comment on the actual physical state of the seal bearing this inscription.

Votive and dedicatory inscriptions are usually found incised on stelae, sculptures, vessels and the like which were dedicated to the deity. Each inscription is of an individual character and there are no exact duplicates. The peculiarity of our votive inscriptions is that in being engraved in reverse on seals, they are certainly made to be impressed on soft material, i.e. clay. *It is obvious that the owners of these seals had them made for repeated use.* For various reasons they seem to have made regular donations to their deities. The seals could be used for stamping clay sealings of jars which contained offerings in kind, e.g. wine, oil, grain and the like or for stamping clay bullae fixed on cords with which bales of goods dedicated to the deity were tied<sup>(19)</sup>.

Of especial interest to this study is the fact that Abinadab had in his possession a religious instrument whose apparent purpose was to permit him to fulfil vows with relative swiftness and ease. Instead of having to inscribe his dedication on each separate occasion that he visited the temple to compensate the deity, the supplicant made use of a pre-inscribed seal, imprinted with a generic formula.

Religious paraphernalia of this nature strongly suggest that votive praxis was not solely reserved for unforeseeable circumstances of extreme distress. On the contrary, one would imagine that Abinadab intended to fulfil his vows frequently; unless we were to assume that warfare, childbirth, adventure and misery constituted the daily currency of his life, we would be hard-pressed to explain this artifact while adhering to the theoretical parameters of the distress hypothesis.

The Old Testament clearly testifies to protagonists who make vows (plural) in moments of extreme distress<sup>(20)</sup>. In other sections of the Bible,

---

La mention *ḥṣḏn* sur ce sceau n'est donc pas à interpréter comme le lieu d'origine... mais comme le lieu de destination de ce sceau votif" (81). The reader should also consider *KAI* 116 where a foreigner seems to be paying his vows in a temple which is not his own; The translation "Asherah-in-Sidon", is preferable in that it calls attention to the fact that the vow was probably made to a local manifestation of Asherah, and not some transregional deity. See McCarter's similar observation regarding the vow of Absalom to "Yahweh-in-Hebron" (P. K. McCARTER JR., "Aspects of the Religion of the Israelite Monarchy: Biblical and Epigraphic Data", *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross* [eds. P. MILLER, P. HANSON and S. MCBRIDE] [Philadelphia 1987] 141).

<sup>(19)</sup> Emphasis mine; AVIGAD, "Two Phoenician Votive seals", 250.

<sup>(20)</sup> Curiously however, the making of *vows* (plural) in distressful circumstances is only indicated in the Psalms and the Proverbs. Jephthah, Hannah, Jacob, Absalom, the exodus Israelites, King Keret and Danel make *one* vow to Yahweh. This discrepancy between the Psalms and the narrative sources is indeed peculiar. Elsewhere I have proposed a solution to this problem (BERLINERBLAU, *The Israelite Vow*, 250-258).

however, we encounter passages which attest to individuals who make vows (pl.) without making reference to distress as a motivating factor. Using the Ammonite evidence as an investigatory archetype for a species of frequent, even mundane, votive behavior, let us now return to the biblical data.

In Deut 12 we initially encounter strands of legislation directed at Israelites (pl.) who are supposed to bring their votive payments (pl.) "... to the site which Yahweh your (pl.) God will choose..." אל-הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר - יבַּחַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם, (Deut 12,5)<sup>(21)</sup>. Yet in v.17 of this chapter, similar legislation is now being addressed to an individual. The singular forms in this verse לא-חִיכֵל, בַּשֶּׁעִיר, refer to a lone suppliant who is instructed to consume part of his votive offerings, נִדְרִיךְ (pl.), in the presence of Yahweh<sup>(22)</sup>.

While this chapter fluctuates between addressing Israelites in singular and plural forms, the use of the former suggests that individual suppliants were known to make multiple vows. Whereas a staunch supporter of the distress hypothesis might maintain that such vows were made in moments of crisis or psychological anxiety, it should be emphasized that this chapter permits no such inference. Rather, the disinterested reference to votive offerings among a series of other forms of common sacrifice (12,6.11.17) suggests that this practice was an ordinary item in the Israelite's religious arsenal; one which the priests expected to routinely encounter.

This phenomenon is not restricted to D. In Num 30, a late Priestly text, we come across an identical scenario. Here, as in the previous instance, worshipers are shown to be making one vow and/or many vows without any indication that they were made in a situation of difficulty. Reference to a sole person making one vow can be found in v. 3, "When a man makes a vow to Yahweh"<sup>(23)</sup>. Yet references to vows (pl.) made by an individual agent are in fact more frequent. In v. 5, for example, we read that should a woman's father offer no objection, all of his daughter's vows shall stand, וְקָמוּ כָל - נִדְרֶיהָ<sup>(24)</sup>.

The depiction of the individual who makes many vows is not restricted to just the legislative environs of the Old Testament. In Job 22,26-27 we receive further evidence of this practice as Eliphaz the Temanite tells Job that Shaddai will fulfil his vows. Here again, it would be difficult to argue that the suppliant in question is thought to make vows in a situation of crisis. For one, a circumstance of distress is not posited as providing the impetus for the making of the vow<sup>(25)</sup>.

<sup>(21)</sup> As in v. 6, where the Israelites are urged to "bring", וּבָאוּם (pl.) their votive payments (pl.) to this same location.

<sup>(22)</sup> In v.26 we are confronted with a similar situation as an individual Israelite is assumed to have votive offerings (pl.) to be brought to the site chosen by Yahweh.

<sup>(23)</sup> Or in v. 4, "When a woman makes a vow..."

<sup>(24)</sup> This phenomenon of a single worshiper making more than one vow is reiterated throughout the chapter, namely vv.6.8.12.13.15.16. In fact, while the MS offers singular and plural readings, other witnesses tend to offer plural readings of נִדְרֵי more frequently. See H. HOLZINGER, *Numeri* (HKAT 4; Tübingen und Leipzig 1903) 145 or P. BUDD, *Numbers* (Word Biblical Commentary 5; Waco 1984) 321.

<sup>(25)</sup> In fact, this verse is placed in a section (vv. 21-30) which emphasizes not the calamity, but the basic amenities, the "good" טוֹבָה (v. 21), which the devoted Yahwist can normally be expected to enjoy (i.e., vv. 21.23.25.27.28).

And secondly: if the institution of vow-making was socially recognized as bound with peril and distress, would it be reasonable to presume that Eliphaz would include future votive activity within the context of a hypothetical discourse on the benefits of pious Yahwism<sup>(26)</sup>? Evidence of this nature is of extreme importance in that it indicates that the authors did not harbor a perception of the vow as inextricably bound to negatively estimated circumstances of misfortune.

Finally, we must point to the most limpid instance of a non-distress vow in the Old Testament. T. Cartledge, who put forward the distress hypothesis, is perhaps the first scholar to acknowledge the existence of a vow which is not precipitated by such a circumstance. He writes: "*Sometimes, however, vows appear as a habitual practice unrelated to any specific trouble* (1 S. 1:21; Ps. 61:8 [MT 9]), often in conjunction with the yearly feasts (Lev. 23:38; 1 S. 1:21; Nah. 1:15 [MT 2:1])" (27).

In the Elkanah episode of 1 Sam 1,21, votive activity is depicted as free of any distressful or catastrophic antecedents. There is no basis for the conclusion that some type of trauma had motivated Elkanah to initiate a vow<sup>(28)</sup>. Quite the opposite, he has made this journey in order to pay the *זבח הימים* (זבח) interpreted by Menahem Haran as "a unique family custom... which was observed once a year, independent of any definite date"<sup>(29)</sup>. Elkanah's pious behavior is depicted as occurring in a mundane context — within the routine cycle of Yahwistic devotion.

### Conclusion

In the narrative and poetic sections of the Old Testament, as noted by many, epic protagonists petition Yahweh solely in moments of tremendous difficulty. Completely overlooked however, has been the entirely different species of votive behavior known to the legal and wisdom traditions and indicated in the aforementioned Ammonite seal.

(26) One also thinks of Isa 19,21 where it is revealed that the Egyptians will eventually worship Yahweh. In this passage it is also suggested that at some future date the Egyptians will make vows to Yahweh and he shall fulfil them. Again we must wonder: if the making of vows was intimately associated with distressful circumstances, would the prophet Isaiah be suggesting that future converts would endure such difficulties?

(27) Emphasis mine, CARTLEDGE, "Vows", 998. I certainly agree with the general theme of Cartledge's remarks, though I would like to note that two of the examples which he cites are actually distress vows. In Ps 61,3, we encounter a protagonist who calls for Yahweh's assistance from "the ends of the earth", apparently while seeking refuge from his enemies. Nah 2,1 also strikes me as a distress vow: the Judaeans are being ordered to fulfil their vows which they made for deliverance from the Assyrians.

(28) Contrary to what some scholars have maintained (H.W. HERTZBERG, *1 and 2 Samuel: A Commentary* [OTL; Philadelphia 1964] 28), there is no reason to believe that Elkanah's vow fulfilment bears any relation to that of his pious spouse. See H.P. SMITH, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (ICC; New York 1899) 12.

(29) M. HARAN, "Zəḇaḥ Hayyamīm", *VT* 19 (1969) 22.

This evidence has provided us with a conceptual framework in which to envision a form of votive praxis where individuals, in no particular situation of distress, frequently supplicate the deity. As such it may be necessary to relocate some votive activity from the realm of the extraordinary, catastrophic occurrence to that of ordinary life.

While postulating the existence of these often-invoked "non-distress" or "mundane" vows, I would suggest that a *situation of perceived need*, and not merely a circumstance of distress, is a better way of describing the common denominator that impels individuals to make positive vows. Accordingly, it may not be quite so far-fetched to posit the existence of vows made with a view to economic fluidity, a good harvest, sexual virtuosity, a neighbor's broken nose or a panacea for an ailing back<sup>(30)</sup>.

1903 Avenue K  
Brooklyn, NY 11230 USA

Jacques BERLINERBLAU

<sup>(30)</sup> I wish to thank Dr. David Sperling of Hebrew Union College for his helpful remarks and editorial suggestions.

# RECENSIONES

## Vetus Testamentum

Ludger SCHWIENHORST-SCHÖNBERGER, *Das Bundesbuch* (Ex 20,22–23,33). Studien zu seiner Entstehung und Theologie (BZAW 188). Berlin–New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1990. XIV-468 p. 23,5 × 16. DM 168,—

Das vorliegende Werk ist die überarbeitete Fassung einer Münsteraner Dissertation von 1989. In seiner Zusammenfassung (415-417) hat Verf. die Hauptergebnisse seiner Monographie zum Bundesbuch (Bb) aufgezählt: Die kasuistische Sammlung des Bb (Ex 21,12–22,16\*) ist dessen ältester Teil. Es handelt sich um ein Schulbuch, entstanden in altisraelitischen Schreiberschulen, die in einer gemeinsamen altorientalischen Rechtstradition standen. Sie schufen aufgrund der Rechtsprechung und juristischer Gelehrsamkeit die kasuistische Rechtssammlung als Dokument literarisch tradierter israelitischer Rechtskultur. Es enthält konkrete Rechtsfälle, die paradigmatischen Charakter haben und dementsprechend auf analoge Situationen passen. Die Sammlung weist daher die systematische Tendenz auf, den gesamten Rechtsbereich zu erfassen. Die Komposition der Sammlung kann man sich so vorstellen, dass ein Grundbestand ergänzt und im Interesse der Vollständigkeit erweitert wurde. Vorgängige Teilsammlungen, wie E. Otto sie annimmt, sind nicht wahrscheinlich. Die Gesetze der Sammlung sind echtes, zur Anwendung bestimmtes Recht. Sie spiegeln eine egalitäre, sesshafte Gesellschaft von Bauern und Hirten in offenen Dörfern. Ihre Autorität ist die des hergebrachten Gewohnheitsrechtes. Sie setzen keine promulgierende Instanz wie die Gottes, des Königs, eines Heiligtums oder eines zentralen Gerichtshofes voraus. Die schriftliche Fixierung der Gesetze tendierte dazu, ihre normative Geltung zu verstärken und das Recht zu vereinheitlichen. Es war rein profanes Recht. Die ältesten Teile reichen vielleicht in vorstaatliche Zeit hinauf. Sie wurden bis ins 9./8. Jh. fortgeschrieben, d. h. das kasuistische Rechtsbuch weist Anzeichen einer Entwicklung auf (entweder eine Redaktion oder eine kontinuierliche "Fortschreibung", 236-238).

Dieses Rechtsbuch wurde in drei Redaktionen überarbeitet. Die erste, *protodeuteronomische*, gottesrechtliche (und umfangreichste) Redaktion hat es im 8./7. Jh. theologisiert. Sie kleidet das Rechtsbuch in die Form der Gottesrede und fügt soziale und sakrale Vorschriften hinzu, die auf alte, vordeuteronomische Traditionen zurückgehen. Das Profanrecht ist Gottes-



recht geworden. Zu dieser Redaktion gehören: 1. Altargesetz, 20,24-26\*, 2. Schuldklaven- und Schuldklavinnengesetz, 21,2-12\*, 3. Asylrecht u. todeswürdige Delikte, 21,13-17, 4. Schutzbestimmungen für Schuldklaven und -sklavinnen, 21,20f.26f, 5. Talionsformel, 21,22aßß.23.24, 6. *kofär*-Regelung, 21,30, 7. Schutz des Diebes vor Blutrache, 22,1f, 8. Schwur, 22,9\*.10\*, 9. Verführung eines nicht verlobten Mädchens, 22,15f, 10. todeswürdige Vergehen, 22,17-19a, 11. soziale Schutzrechte, 22,20aa.22b.24a\*.25f, 12. Sakralgebote, 22,27-29, 13. unbestechliche Rechtsprechung, 23,1-7, 14. Brachjahr, Ruhetag, 23,10-12, 15. Festkalender, 23,14-19\*, 16. Epilog, 23,20-33\* (284). Eine *deuteronomistische* Bearbeitung trägt deuteronomische Themen in das Bb ein und gleicht gewisse Bestimmungen an die Gesetze des Dtn an. Sie ist durch die Anrede in 2. P. Pl. gekennzeichnet. Dazu gehören: 1. Bilderverbot, 20,23, 2. "Gemeinschaftsopfer, Brandopfer" in 20,24aß, 3. Überschrift 21,1, 4. der Terminus "Hebräer" in 21,2aa\* und die Zeremonie an der Tür, 21,6aßy, 5. Verbot, die Schuldklavin an ein fremdes Volk zu verkaufen, 21,8b, 6. Zusatz zur Talionsformel in 21,25, 7. "Ausser JHWH allein" in 22,19b, 8. Fremdsein in Ägypten, Schutz von Waisen und Witwen, Zinsverbot, 22,20aßß.21.22a.23.24aa\*b, 9. Verbot des Genusses von Gerissenem, 22,30, 10. Verbot der Bestechung und Schutz des Fremden im Gericht, 23,8.9, 11. Fremdgötterverbot, 23,13, 12. "wie ich dir befohlen habe", 23,15aa\*, 13. Epilog, 23,20-33\* (286). Schliesslich geht der Bezug auf den Dekalog in 20,22aßß auf P zurück (P-Redaktion) (286).

Aus diesem Überblick wird deutlich, dass der Hauptanteil am Bb auf die kasuistische Rechtssammlung und auf die protodeuteronomische Redaktion zurückgeht. Damit ist es ein sehr alter Text im AT. Ebenfalls ist klar, dass Verf. als ältesten Kern des Bb ein *profanes* Rechtsbuch annimmt, dessen erste grosse Bearbeitung vordeuteronomisch ist. Sch. rückt damit von der Position von Jörn Halbe ab und vertritt dieselbe Ansicht wie Eckart Otto.

In Kap. 1 untersucht Verf. die Struktur des Bb. Nach Diskussion der in der Forschung vertretenen Positionen arbeitet er eine umfassende, konzentrische Struktur des Bb heraus, zu der Bilderverbot und Altargesetz am Eingang, 20,23-26, und Fremdgötterverbot und Festkalender, 23,13b-19 am Ende gehören (Schema auf 23). Diese Struktur ist redaktionell, wie das kurze 2. Kap. im Lichte von 21,12-17 zeigt (38-43). Hier berührt sich der kasuistische Grundbestand mit der als Gottesrede stilisierten Bearbeitung. Da das Asyl für den unfreiwilligen Totschläger, 22,13f, ein Zusatz ist, der mit dem Altargesetz, 20,24-26 zusammengehört (gleiche Konzeption einer legitimen Vielzahl von Altären), und deshalb vor der deuteronomischen Kultzentralisierung anzusetzen ist, ist für Bearbeitung und Grundbestand eine wichtige Standortsbestimmung gewonnen: sie liegen *vor* dem Deuteronomium.

Das 3. Kap. (44-283) behandelt das kasuistische Rechtsbuch. Es handelt sich um einen eigentlichen Kommentar, der Forschungsüberblicke, literarkritische Analysen und Interpretation der Rechtsfälle im Horizont des altorientalischen Rechts einschliesst. Am Schluss (234-238) wird eine Überarbeitung im Rechtsbuch *vor* der protodeuteronomischen Redaktion und *innerhalb* derselben charakterisiert. Das Kap. wird abgeschlossen mit der historischen Einordnung des kasuistischen Rechtsbuches. Das Hauptinteresse

des Verf. gilt dabei der Frage nach dem Kontakt dieses kasuistischen Buches mit dem altorient. Recht (238-268). Sch. betrachtet Ex 21,35 als *literarisch* abhängig, nämlich als Übersetzung von Codex Eschnunna § 53 (159). Diese Einzelbeobachtung passt zu den zahlreichen andern Berührungspunkten zwischen Codex Hammurapi und Eschnunna einerseits, Bb andererseits. Eine solche Verwandtschaft zwischen altorient. und israelit. Recht im Bb beruht nach Verf. — im Anschluss an Arbeiten von Westbrook über die Funktionen altorient. Rechtssammlungen und von Lemaire und anderen über Schreiberschulen und -ausbildung im alten Orient — auf einer wissenschaftlichen, gelehrten Beschäftigung mit Recht in Schulen, die ein aus der Rechtssprechung gewachsenes Recht verallgemeinerten und systematisierten. Auf S. 268-276 zeigt Sch., dass sozialer Ort (Dörfer mit bäuerlicher und Hirtenbevölkerung in egalitärer Gesellschaftsordnung) und Zeit (10./9. Jh.) nicht gegen eine solche Gattungsbestimmung der kasuistischen Rechtssammlung sprechen. So gesehen steht hinter der kasuistischen Rechtssammlung im Bb keine promulgierende Autorität, wohl aber eine Rechtspraxis "im Tor" und eine juristische Bildung in Schulen, die sich im Bb verbinden.

Das letzte Kap. (284-414) charakterisiert die drei Redaktionen, von denen die vordeuteronomische die gewichtigste ist. Wiederum handelt es sich um einen detaillierten Kommentar der diesen Redaktionen zugeschriebenen Gesetze und Ergänzungen.

Das Buch wird abgeschlossen mit einem sehr ausführlichen Literaturverzeichnis, einem Stellenregister bibl. und orient. Quellen, einem Autoren- und einem Sachregister.

Es ist ein glänzend geschriebenes, vorzüglich argumentiertes und klar dargebotenes Werk. Sehr angenehm ist es, dass Verf. alle Texte, die er diskutiert, stets im Wortlaut zitiert und übersichtlich vorlegt. Es ist selten, redaktionsgeschichtliche Argumentationen methodisch so klar und leserfreundlich dargestellt zu finden wie hier. Der Stil ist einfach und durchsichtig. Darin ist das Buch beispielhaft. Verarbeitete Literatur und Kenntnis des Forschungsstandes verdienen vorbehaltlose Bewunderung.

In ihren grossen Zügen wirkt Sch.s Redaktionskritik auf mich plausibel. Meine Bedenken gelten einzelnen Interpretationen. Hier einige Beispiele: zu 21,12-14 (39f, 102) ist festzuhalten, dass in V. 13 keine "fahrlässige", sondern eine unabsichtliche Tötung gemeint ist. Fahrlässig und unabsichtlich werden im Bb unterschieden, wie 21,29 im Vergleich mit 21,13 zeigt. Im Bb gibt es vier Stufen der Absichtlichkeit: Vorbedacht (21,14), Affekt (21,20), indirekte Absicht (21,22), Fahrlässigkeit (21,29). 21,12-14 besteht nicht aus *drei* Fällen: Tötung ohne Unterscheidung zwischen Absicht oder Unabsichtlichkeit, unabsichtliche Tötung, vorsätzliche Tötung, sondern aus *zwei* Fällen: absichtliche Tötung (V. 12), unabsichtliche Tötung (V. 13), während V. 14 ein Kriterium der Absichtlichkeit hinzufügt: Vorbedacht ist immer Absicht. V. 13 zeigt, dass V. 12 absichtliche Tötung meint. Denn ist V. 13 ein Zusatz, wie Verf. wohl zu Recht annimmt, ist V. 13 eine sehr alte Interpretation von V. 12 (die älteste Interpretation, die wir haben!), die V. 12 *ausdrücklich* auf absichtliche Tötungen beschränkt. Da die Asyl-Institution wohl älter als die Redaktion ist, auf die der Zusatz von V. 13f zu-

rückgeht (nach Verf. 9./8. Jh.), vgl. 1 Kön 1,28, spricht dieser Zusatz wohl eine ältere, stillschweigende Interpretation ausdrücklich aus und ist *keine mit der Redaktion zeitgenössische Novellierung* eines älteren Gesetzes, demzufolge jede Tötung, gleichviel ob absichtlich oder unabsichtlich, mit dem Tod geahndet worden wäre. Zu 21,18f: m. E. handelt es sich hier um *vorübergehenden* Schaden eines Menschen, während V.22-25 *bleibenden* Schaden betreffen. Zu 21,20f: "ein oder zwei Tage" in V.20 muss im Gegensatz zu "unter seiner Hand" (V.21) verstanden werden: entweder stirbt der Geschlagene sogleich, oder er lebt einen oder zwei Tage weiter. Dann ist der Tod nicht als natürlich zu betrachten, aber die Schläge können nicht als unmittelbare Tötung angelastet werden. Als Strafe gilt dann der selbstverschuldete Verlust der Arbeitsleistung, die der Knecht erbracht haben würde, hätte er gelebt ("denn es ist sein Geld"). Der Fall behandelt die Absichtlichkeit des Handelns aus Affekt. 21,20 meint nach Sch. stellvertretende Talion (74), wie sie in Dtn 24,16 vorkomme. Aber stellvertretende Talion (für eine beeinträchtigte Person wird nicht der Schuldige, sondern die der beeinträchtigten Person *entsprechende* Person im Haushalt des Schuldigen in gleicher Weise beeinträchtigt) gibt es in Rechtstexten des AT nicht. Dtn 24,16 ist etwas anderes (Haftung irgendeines Mitgliedes der Familie für ein anderes *ohne Symmetrie*). Zur Talion: Sch. leitet aus der 2. P. in V.23 im Unterschied zur 3. P. in V.22 die Aufteilung von Fall und Gegenfall (V.22f) auf zwei literarische Schichten ab, ohne den Einwand E. Ottos (*Wandel der Rechtsbegründungen in der Gesellschaftsgeschichte des antiken Israel* [Leiden 1988] 28) zu diskutieren, dass es sich auch um eine stilist. begründbare Wendung handeln könnte (wie Dtn 17,8-13, u. a.) (117f). V.22f meine fahrlässige Körperverletzung (115f). Der handgreifliche Streit impliziert aber Absicht, wie Sch. wohl begründet (109-111), nur trifft der absichtliche Schlag eine unbeteiligte Person (übrigens nicht die Frau eines der am Kampf beteiligten Männer, S.112-115; im Unterschied zu Dtn 25,11f sagt der Text das *gerade nicht!*). Es ist somit der Fall eines *aus Absichtlichkeit und Unabsichtlichkeit gemischten* Tatbestandes ins Auge gefasst (indirekte oder oblique Absicht). Dieser Fall ist *nicht Fahrlässigkeit*. Bei Fahrlässigkeit ist überhaupt keine positive Absichtlichkeit, sondern nur Unterlassung gegeben. Bei der Liste der Verletzungen von V.23-25 ist nur die Unwahrscheinlichkeit der genannten Körperverletzungen in der Situation des Streites von V.22 erwähnt. Was aber hat Ergänzter dazu bewogen, V.25, evtl. V.24 hinzuzufügen? Die allen gemeinsame Qualität *bleibender*, nicht rückgängig zu machender und *daher nicht adäquat wägbarer Schäden!* Das ist das grundsätzlichabstrakte Problem, das die Talio — wie immer in dieser Rechtskultur im Gewand eines konkreten Falles — betrachtet: wie ist vorzugehen bei Schäden, die *nicht kongruent wiedergutmacht* werden können? Leider reicht der Raum nicht, um zahlreiche andere Punkte dieses wichtigen Buches zu diskutieren, das für die Forschung am Bb ein Markstein bleiben wird.

Stuart A. IRVINE, *Isaiah, Ahaz, and the Syro-Ephraimitic Crisis* (SBL Dissertation Series 123). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1990. xvii-360 p. 14 × 21,5

La obra que presentamos es la tesis de S.A. Irvine, dirigida por J.H. Hayes. Tras el clásico prólogo en este tipo de trabajos, un primer capítulo ofrece un panorama crítico de los estudios existentes sobre los puntos fundamentales que la obra va a tratar, y nos anticipa ya la tesis del autor.

El cuerpo de la obra se divide en tres partes. La primera se ocupa del problema histórico propiamente dicho. Un capítulo estudia detalladamente las fuentes asirias y otro los textos bíblicos relativos a la guerra siro-efraimita. La segunda parte estudia minuciosamente los textos de Isaías, justifica en cada caso su situación histórica dentro del marco de la guerra y, a partir de ahí, saca las necesarias conclusiones, referentes a la posición de Isaías en el conflicto y a su visión teológica.

La parte tercera está dedicada a la conclusión de todo el trabajo. Sigue una amplia bibliografía, y dos índices, uno de autores citados y otro de textos bíblicos completan la obra.

El plan del estudio de S.A. Irvine es lógico y coherente y su desarrollo cuidadoso y armónico. El estilo de S.A. Irvine es claro y preciso. Al final de cada capítulo el autor resume y presenta sobriamente sus conclusiones, permitiendo así al lector constatar con claridad el avance en los análisis y resultados.

Los estudios sobre la guerra siro-efraimita son abundantes aunque no sea más que por la implicación de Isaías en el asunto. Todo comentario de Isaías tiene que pasar obligatoriamente por la guerra siro-efraimita y viceversa. En este campo ampliamente trabajado, el autor presenta su propia visión. Para S.A. Irvine hay que partir de la historia si se quiere entender la posición de Isaías, sus relaciones con Ahaz, su teología. Compartimos plenamente la posición del autor. Los datos históricos y la reconstrucción de la historia que S.A. Irvine realiza le llevan a la convicción de que Ahaz optó por una actitud neutra frente a Asiria en el conflicto entre ésta y los pequeños reinos de Siria-Palestina. Ahaz no habría llamado en su ayuda a Teglafalasar III, sino que pagó tributo cuando éste se encontraba ya en la región para sofocar la rebelión de los coligados siro-palestinos. Por su parte, Isaías apoyó plenamente la política del rey de Jerusalén y, por lo tanto, no hubo discrepancias entre el soberano y el profeta sobre la actitud a tomar frente al ataque de Damasco-Samaria contra Jerusalén. El propósito de este ataque era evidentemente cambiar de soberano en Jerusalén para propiciar así una política anti-asiria.

Creemos útil recordar que S.A. Irvine colabora estrechamente con J.H. Hayes. El autor, en su prólogo, menciona los distintos aspectos de esta colaboración. Ambos exegetas han publicado recientemente un comentario de Isaías. Por su parte, J.H. Hayes había publicado ya una historia de Israel (J.H. Hayes-J.M. Miller, *Israelite and Judean History* [Philadelphia 1977]) y más recientemente una cronología de la historia de Israel (J.H. Hayes-P.K. Hooker, *A New Chronology for the Kings of Israel and Judah and Its Implications for Biblical History and Literature* [Atlanta 1988]).

Las conclusiones de S. A. Irvine referentes a Isaías 7,1-17 y 8,1-20 me parecen aceptables en general. 7,1-17 es un oráculo de salvación, positivo, cuyo destinatario es la casa/dinastía de David y responde al problema crucial del momento: la amenaza de los coligados contra la dinastía davídica. La joven encinta debe ser una princesa real. Por nuestra parte, no dudamos que se trata de la esposa de Ahaz. Disentimos con Irvine sobre la identidad de Emanuel. Nosotros creemos que se trata de Ezequías. Esta discrepancia pone de manifiesto uno de los puntos claves de la obra de Irvine: la cronología.

En el apéndice de las páginas 73-74 el autor presenta la «*cronología real de Israel y Judá*» siguiendo paso a paso las opciones de Hayes-Hooker ya citadas. Irvine explicita y asume las conclusiones e hipótesis que dicha cronología lleva consigo. Su justificación la da por conocida remitiendo al lector a la obra correspondiente.

No se trata aquí de hacer la recensión de Hayes-Hooker. Todos conocemos la dificultad de establecer una cronología de la historia de Israel. El recurso a hipótesis o a reconstrucciones más o menos probables es inevitable. Resulta difícil renunciar a la coregencia y a una cierta confusión en las fechas propuestas por los textos bíblicos. La cronología que apela a estas hipótesis es ciertamente fragmentaria, frágil. Pero esta misma impresión se obtiene de la propuesta por Hayes-Hooker y seguida por Irvine. Tenemos que reconocer que la diferencia temporal entre la llegada al poder y la entronización podía ser de casi un año. Este dato complica considerablemente todo tentativo de correlación y armonía de fechas. Por otra parte, no es menos cierto que la cronología propuesta por Hayes-Hooker utiliza gustosamente en su elaboración este posible margen de tiempo. Así pueden compaginarse, por ejemplo, las diferencias entre los datos que ofrecen los textos asirios (III R 10,2 entre otros) — según éstos Oseas destronó a Pecaj en 732/731 (Irvine, 68) —, y la cronología del autor que sitúa el comienzo del reinado oficial de Oseas en 730/729. Esta es la fecha que «cuadra» en la cronología de Hayes-Hooker. Pero para ello hay que jugar con el margen «llegada al poder/entronización» e imaginar una hipotética guerra civil entre Oseas y Pecaj de varios meses (Irvine, 74) de la que ningún texto (bíblico o asirio) dice nada.

Lo mismo podemos observar del reinado semi-autónomo de Pecaj en «Galaad» durante dieciséis años. Deducir de 2 R 15,25 este reinado semi-autónomo de Pecaj es pura hipótesis. ¿Qué quiere decir reinado «semi-autónomo»? ¿Existen otros casos en la Biblia? Que en los diversos golpes de estado del reino del Norte la dimensión tribal existiera (contrariamente al sur) es muy probable. Pero la invención de un reinado semi-autónomo de Pecaj para salvar los «veinte años» de reinado del texto bíblico en la hipótesis de Hayes aceptada por Irvine, convence todavía menos que las presentadas por otros autores en el establecimiento de la cronología de los reyes de Israel y Judá.

El segundo punto clave de la tesis de Irvine es su interpretación de 2 R 16. El autor afirma con razón que la interpretación clásica de la posición de Isaías en la guerra siro-efraimita depende de 2 R 16. En efecto, el v.7 afirma que Ahaz envió mensajeros a Teglathfalasar declarándose su «hijo y su

siervo», para pedirle ayuda contra los coligados siro-efraimitas. Esto quiere decir que Ahaz hizo caso omiso de la intervención de Is 7, y que por lo tanto no optó por una posición neutra y de espera dejando que los asirios interviniesen por propia iniciativa. Ahora bien, Irvine afirma que 2 R 16,7 es un texto deuteronomista que atribuye a Ahaz una actitud de sumisión a los asirios, y por lo tanto impía, contrastando con la de su hijo Ezequías años más tarde.

Hay que reconocer que Irvine ha puesto el dedo en la llaga del fundamento de la interpretación clásica de la posición de Isaías en esta guerra respecto a Ahaz. Lo cual no quiere decir que la solución propuesta sea convincente. Hay que verla de cerca ya que es el pilar fundamental de toda la tesis.

Los argumentos propuestos por Irvine tocantes a la reforma litúrgica de Ahaz son interesantes y convincentes. La conclusión nº 3 (82) es más problemática. La redacción actual dice que Ahaz fué a Damasco para ver a Teglafalasar. En la situación general de la época la razón es válida. ¿Qué habría ido a hacer Ahaz en Damasco antes de dicha guerra? Por otro lado la razón nº 4 parece estar en contra de la tesis del autor.

El nudo gordiano se encuentra en los vv. 5-9. Irvine considera que la continuidad entre los vv. 5 y 7-9 es problemática. Tras el sumario del v. 5 no hace falta nada más. Salvo que, podemos responder a Irvine, los vv. 7-9 explicitan el v. 5, dando datos y matices que no se encuentran en el v. 5. La correspondencia de los tiempos verbales entre v. 5 y 7-9 le parecen igualmente problemáticos. A nuestro entender, y siguiendo a Joüon citado por Irvine, no vemos la dificultad.

Es cierto que los vv. 7-9 son difícilmente imaginables sin el v. 5 y que éste puede existir sin aquellos. Hay que reconocer igualmente que *šôhad* puede tener un matiz despectivo. Pero un tributo al país extranjero difícilmente puede ser concebido de otra forma. Por lo que se refiere a la fórmula «soy tu servidor y tu hijo» (que Irvine, siguiendo a Tadmor-Cogan, atribuye a la invención del deuteronomista), la argumentación no convence. La expresión, como dice Irvine, no se encuentra en la Biblia. Sí en algunos textos extra-bíblicos. ¿Es ésta razón suficiente para atribuirle a la inventiva del deuteronomista? ¿Existen contactos reales de esta fórmula como tal, con otros textos seguros del deuteronomista? Y si no, ¿por qué atribuírsela cuando existen algunos textos, raros ciertamente, fuera de la Biblia?

Por otro lado, el paralelismo de 2 R 16,7-9 con 1 R 15,16-22 me parece más que problemático. El esquema político de base de ambos casos es muy semejante: un rey en apuros apela a una tercera potencia para que le salve, y paga por ello. Pero los actores de ambos relatos no se presentan ni actúan de la misma forma, las consecuencias son muy diversas en ambos casos y el texto bíblico no parece tratarlos de la misma manera.

Finalmente, la atribución de algunos textos de Isaías a la época de la guerra siro-efraimita plantea problemas. Estamos de acuerdo con Irvine en que la mejor forma de leer Is 10,27d-32 es situándolo en el marco de la guerra siro-efraimita. El itinerario seguido por el ejército se comprende mejor en esta hipótesis.

Otra cosa es 8,21-9,6. Judá habría sido vasallo de Israel durante 70 años o más, y este texto cantaría el final de dicho vasallaje tras la dominación del reino del Norte por los asirios. No podemos menos de reconocer que la hipótesis es aventurada.

10,5-15 debería ser visto como parte integrante de la predicación del profeta durante la guerra siro-efraimita. Las explicaciones de Irvine sobre las ciudades mencionadas en el texto no convencen. Por otro lado no hay que olvidar que el v. 12, glosa posterior ciertamente, se enmarca mejor en la predicación de Isaías durante la crisis de 701. En efecto, la actitud de Judá provoca la crítica del profeta que anuncia el castigo de Jerusalén (Is 28,14-22 entre otros). El glosador de 10,12 ha explicitado el «non-dit» del texto de Isaías.

La tesis de Irvine estimula al lector y pone en tela de juicio las cronologías de Israel y Judá, la petición de ayuda de Ahaz a los asirios (que sirve de punto de partida para afirmar que Isaías se opuso a la política del rey y le criticó). Pero las soluciones propuestas y la atribución de un cierto número de textos de Isaías a la época de la guerra siro-efraimita aparecen tan hipotéticas, por lo menos, como las opiniones rechazadas por el autor.

Institut Catholique de Paris  
21, rue d'Assas  
F-75006 Paris

J. ASURMENDI

Rex MASON, *Preaching the Tradition. Homily and Hermeneutics after the Exile*. Based on the "addresses" in Chronicles, the "speeches" in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah and the post-exilic prophetic books. Cambridge, University Press, 1990. ix-325 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £35.00-\$49.50

Gegenstand der Untersuchung sind zunächst die Reden oder Ansprachen ("addresses") der Chronikbücher, 32 an der Zahl, von 1 Chr 12,19 bis 2 Chr 36,23 (13-122 u. 254-280, Zusammenfassung 123-144). Vergleichend werden dann im selben Stil die Reden in Esra und Neh untersucht (147-183 u. 281-285), wobei "Rede" mitunter weiter gefaßt wird, so daß z.B. auch Esra 5,11-16; 6,2-12; 7,11-26 und Neh 10,29-40 mitreden dürfen. Noch weiter wird der Bogen gespannt, wenn schließlich Hag, Sach 1-8 und Mal einbezogen werden (185-256 u. 285-297), wo man schon immer eine gewisse Verwandtschaft mit dem Chronistischen Werk festgestellt hat. Der Rezensent hat mit viel Zustimmung verfolgt, wie die Reden in 1 und 2 Chr — m.E. auch in Esra/Neh — als eigene fiktive Beiträge des Chronisten ausgewiesen werden, der in Sprache, Inhalt und Formelementen ständig wiederzuerkennen ist. Aktualisierend interpretiert der Chronist ältere Schrifttexte für die nachexilische Situation. Theologisch zeichnet sich eine unmessianische Tempeltheokratie ab. Auf die vielen Goldkörner der Darlegungen des Verfassers sei nachdrücklich ein für allemal hingewiesen, damit Raum bleibt für die dem Buch gebührende kritische Auseinandersetzung.

Viele werden bedauern, daß der Verfasser in Anbetracht seiner guten Beobachtungen nicht klarer Stellung bezieht hinsichtlich der drei ersten jener vier Fragen, die er Ss. 7-11 einleitend zur Untersuchung der chronistischen Stellen formuliert: 1) Die Einheit von 1 und 2 Chr; 2) das Verhältnis von Esra/Neh zu 1 und 2 Chr, mit Einschluß der Frage nach dem historischen Charakter von Esra/Neh (vgl. etwa S. 183); 3) die zeitliche Ansetzung des Chronisten. (Die vierte Frage betrifft die Vorlage des Chronisten im Bereich von Samuel/Könige.) Der Grund für die Zögerlichkeit ist darin zu suchen, daß der Verfasser seine Untersuchungen mit dem Blick auf eine andere Hintergrundproblematik betrieben hat. Was sich aus seinen wertvollen Beobachtungen wirklich schließen läßt, hat er nicht weiter verfolgt; was sich m.E. *nicht* daraus schließen läßt, war ihm Zielvorstellung. Zum Glück sind die Auswirkungen nicht tragisch, weil die Substanz des Buches eben doch aus dem Beobachten von Sachverhalten besteht und die Hintergrundproblematik, wie der Verfasser sie sieht, mehr rhetorisches Postulat bleibt.

Die besagte Hintergrundproblematik und zugleich Lieblingsvorstellung des Verfassers besteht negativ in einer Absage an die schon öfter kritisierte Theorie G. von Rads, derzufolge die "levitische Predigt" für die Reden der Chronikbücher Pate gestanden haben soll. Positiv setzt der Verfasser an die Stelle der "levitischen Predigt" eine irgendwie geartete Predigtstätigkeit am nachexilischen Tempel (vgl. zusammenfassend Ss. 1-3). Diese soll sich inhaltlich und vor allem auch methodisch (aktualisierende Interpretation älterer Schrifttexte aus Gesetz und Propheten) sowohl in den Reden von 1 und 2 Chr und Esra/Neh als auch in Hag, Sach 1-8 und Mal spiegeln.

Nun kann man fragen, ob der Theorie von Rads, die übrigens mit den Beobachtungen des Verfassers kaum zu widerlegen ist, nicht zu viel Ehre angetan wird, wenn sie zum Ausgangspunkt der Untersuchung gemacht wird. Zu entschuldigen ist es damit, daß interessanten Ideen großer Lehrer oft eine Akzeptanz beschieden ist, die zwar objektiv nicht begründet erscheint (und den Meistern selbst in dieser Form auch gar nicht wünschenswert war), aber gleichwohl eine forschungsgeschichtliche Realität ist. Wie dem auch sei, das Phantom der "levitischen Predigt" als negativer Ausgangspunkt hat zusammen mit der Zielvorstellung einer nachexilischen Tempelpredigt zu einer Einengung der Untersuchungsbasis auf Rede-Texte geführt, was vom wirklichen Ertrag der Arbeit her zwar nicht verboten, aber auch nicht positiv gerechtfertigt erscheint. Was nämlich auf der Basis der Reden erhoben werden kann, das ließe sich auch aus original chronistischen Texten außerhalb der Reden gewinnen. Vereinzelt hat der Verfasser denn auch Texte einbezogen, die gar nicht die Form einer Rede oder Ansprache an sich tragen (Esra 5,11-16; 6,2-12; 7,11-26; Neh 10,29-40). Man sollte meinen, daß insbesondere Gebete wie 1 Chr 29,10-29; 2 Chr 20,6-12; Esra 9,5-15; Neh 1,5-11 und 9,6-37 zur Sache gehören. Die "levitische Predigt" oder überhaupt die Einengung auf Reden hat weiterhin dazu geführt, daß etwas pedantisch die kleinste Äußerung Esras oder Nehemias als "address" eingestuft wird. (Andererseits fehlt 1 Chr 22,1.)

Wie steht es nun mit der nachexilischen Tempelpredigt, die an die Stelle der "levitischen Predigt" von Rads treten soll? Einen Nachweis vermag ich nicht zu sehen, obwohl der Verfasser seine Tempelpredigt ziemlich weit



gefaßt hat, so daß "all oral methods of instruction in the tradition" darunter fallen (vgl. etwa Ss. 2, 143 und 259). Auf einem derart unsicheren Gelände sei es erlaubt, die eigene Sicht als kritische Stellungnahme vorzulegen. Mit Recht hebt der Verfasser hervor, daß nach dem Exil Anstrengungen gemacht wurden, Identität und Kontinuität zu wahren. Die Vergangenheit wurde nachgestaltend bewältigt, um das neue Heil für die Zukunft zu verkünden. Es entstand, mit einem Wort gesagt, das Alte Testament. Zuerst wurden "Gesetz und Propheten" erstellt, worunter wohlgemerkt auch Hag, Sach und Mal figurieren. In einer späteren Phase, gleichsam als Interpretation zweiten Grades, entsteht unter anderem das Chronistische Werk. Hervorzuheben ist, daß sich die wesentliche Interpretation der Vergangenheit (und Heilsverkündigung für die Zukunft) im gesamten Bereich des Alten Testaments vollzieht, also nicht erst in Hag, Sach, Mal und dem Chronistischen Werk. In besonders deutlicher Form sind die Prophetenbücher von nachexilischer Interpretation geprägt. (Ähnliches deutet der Verfasser S. 2, oben, an.) Nun stellt sich die entscheidende Frage, ob wirklich, wie der Verfasser verfährt, hinter dem nachexilischen Interpretationsvorgang, den wir nur im literarischen Produkt kennen, eine Tempelpredigt im weitesten Sinn, jedenfalls ein mündlicher Vorgang steht. M.E. ist die rein literarische Ausarbeitung der Heilsbotschaft primär. Es wurde also nicht erst "verkündet" — z.B. auch nicht bei Deuterocesaja — und dann in literarischer Nachgestaltung verschriftet, sondern umgekehrt am Schreibtisch geschaffen und auf dieser Basis schriftgelehrt vermittelt. Nicht eine aktuelle nachexilische Tempelpredigt hat Modell gestanden, sondern die Literaten haben Könige und vorexilische Propheten so reden lassen, wie es die Erinnerung an vorexilische Institutionen noch wußte oder wie man es sich vorstellte und gestalten wollte. Entgegen der S. 259 (oben) geäußerten Meinung, daß die Formkritik sich heute von der rein literarischen Sehensweise der Exegese des 19. Jahrhunderts befreien müsse, sollten wir lieber die Unbesonnenheiten der form- und traditionskritischen Ära A. Alts, M. Noths und G. von Rads korrigieren.

In der Anlage der Untersuchung spielt die Verwandtschaft von 1 und 2 Chr samt Esra/Neh mit Hag, Sach und Mal eine Rolle. Doch ist zu bedenken, daß Hag, Sach und Mal, wie immer die chronistischen Züge in diesen Büchern zu erklären sind, zur Kanongruppe der "Propheten" gehören und dem Chronisten bereits als zu interpretierende Texte vorgelegen haben. Die erwähnte Verwandtschaft ist manchmal deutlich Abhängigkeit des Späteren vom Früheren. Man vergleiche etwa Esra 5,1-2 mit Hag und Sach sowie Esra 9,2 mit Mal 2,15. Beide Esra-Stellen kommen in der Untersuchung nicht vor.

Kleinere Anmerkungen und eine Auswahl zufällig entdeckter Versehen: S. 21, Z. 14: Schimi (Shimei) neben Joab als Sohn der Zeruja; S. 31, Anm. a: In Anbetracht von u.a. 1 Chr 17,16f; 22,1.19; 29,1; 2 Chr 6,41f (unter Abänderung der Vorlage!); 26,18; 32,16 (sonst noch Ex 9,30 und konstant in Gen 2-3) ist "Jahwe Elohim" nicht anfechtbar; S. 101, Z. 4; lies *za'awāh* (Q)/*zēwā'āh* (K) (übrigens mit *zajin* statt mit *šādē*); S. 170, Anm. b: Ni. *mlk* "mit sich selbst zu Rate gehen" pflegen die Lexikographen von *mlk* "König sein" zu trennen; S. 173, Anm. a: zu Nehemia als

*tiršātāh* (außer Neh 8,9 noch 7,69 und 10,2) vgl. J. Becker, *Esra/Nehemia* (Würzburg 1990), zu Neh 7,69 u. 8,9; S. 179, Anm. 2, Z. 2: Ezra statt Eze-kiel; S. 187, Z. 5 v.u.: 2 Sam 23,1-7; S. 237, Z. 1: außer Mal 2,7 eventuell Koh 5,5 (auch S. 244, Z. 12 v.u.); S. 273, Z. 3: ninth century; S. 281, Z. 4 v.u.: lies "of the Aramaic *be'dajin* was *kāzo't*" (so eher statt *kēzo't*).

Kardinal-von-Galen-Str. 3  
D-4712 Werne

Joachim BECKER

Robert L. HUBBARD, Jr., *The Book of Ruth* (The New International Commentary on the Old Testament). Grand Rapids, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988. XIV-317p. 22 × 14,6. £20.95

Dies ist ein wichtiger Kommentar. Daß er so umfangreich geraten ist, begründet sein Verfasser so: "It is said that when the renowned nineteenth-century German scholar, Julius Wellhausen, saw a colleague's new book, he remarked, 'So thick a book for so thin a subject!' Since Ruth has only four chapters (barely 85 verses!), readers may be similarly startled at the length of this book. They wonder how so simple a story as the book tells could require such extensive comment. In reply, I grant that the book's apparent simplicity tempts one to treat Ruth casually. I have, however, sought to take the book seriously since, in fact, behind its simplicity lurk both knotty interpretative problems to be solved and rich literary art to be savored" (ix). Um es vorweg zu sagen: Das fachwissenschaftliche Gewicht des Kommentars liegt in seiner differenzierten Diskussion der vielen Einzelprobleme, die Rt stellt. Sowohl in der "Einleitung" (1-80) wie bei der fortlaufenden Textkommentierung (81-285) findet eine detaillierte Diskussion mit den in der Forschung vorgelegten Positionen (allerdings nur bis 1985!) statt; vor allem im Kommentarteil bietet der ausführliche Apparat von Anmerkungen eine gute Information, aber auch zahlreiche Einzelbeobachtungen des Verfassers selbst. Was freilich die Gesamtinterpretation angeht, sowohl hinsichtlich des zeitgeschichtlichen Kontextes als auch der theologischen Programmatik der Erzählung, ist der Kommentar in meinen Augen eher problematisch. Dies hängt nicht zuletzt damit zusammen, daß es dem Verfasser nicht gelingt, die narrative Gesamtkomposition (!) als theologisches Programm zu erfassen. Zwar werden, teilweise zu Beginn der einzelnen Abschnitte, teilweise in den Anmerkungen, viele Eigenheiten der stilistischen und literarischen Technik der Erzählung notiert, aber daraus entsteht keine Gesamtstruktur, deren unterschiedliche Elemente auf ihre Handlungs- und Aussageintention hin befragt würden. Gewiß, die Kommentierung selbst folgt in ihrer Gliederung einem Schema, das unter der Überschrift "Analysis of Contents" (74f.) abgedruckt ist. Zu dessen Begründung heißt es freilich nur: "It is a simple device which enables the reader to grasp the main sections and flow of thought... Methodologically, it conforms to the approach which G. M. Tucker articulated (*Form Criticism of the Old Testa-*

ment [Philadelphia 1971]) and which the FOTL series, edited by Tucker and R.P. Knierim, follows". Daß aber nun gerade der Ruth-Kommentar in FOTL von R. Murphy, der methodisch den gleichen Prinzipien folgt, im Detail eine andere literarische Struktur beschreibt, hätte der Verfasser wenigstens mitteilen sollen, vor allem aber hätte dies ihn bewegen müssen, seine eigene Struktur näher zu begründen und zu erläutern. Die Positionen, die dem Kommentar zugrundeliegen, lassen sich so zusammenfassen:

1. Das Buch ist in literarkritischer Hinsicht ein einheitliches Werk. Auch die Genealogie 4,18-22 ist, abweichend von der *opinio plurimum*, keine spätere Hinzufügung. Insbesondere die Wünsche 4,11f bereiten die Genealogie vor. Sogar die kommentierende Notiz 4,7 ist höchstwahrscheinlich ursprünglich. Möglicherweise inspiriert sich die Erzählung an vorgegebenen Stoffen und Motiven, doch wirken diese nirgends so nach, daß sie für die Interpretation relevant wären.

2. Die Erzählung ist das Werk einer Frau. So ist am ehesten die Frauenperspektive zu erklären, die die ganze Erzählung kennzeichnet. Es ist eine Geschichte über die Notsituation zweier Frauen in einer von Männern dominierten Gesellschaft. Die Rettung aus dieser Not geht nicht von Männern aus, sondern verdankt sich der Initiative und der Beharrlichkeit der Frauen selbst. Die Erzählung ist so eine implizite Kritik an der männlichen Gesellschaft, insbesondere an dem Mr. Soundso (4,1) und an Boas.

3. Als Entstehungszeit kommt am ehesten die Epoche Salomos, möglicherweise sogar die Zeit Davids, in Frage. Für diese These spricht die deutlich erkennbare politische Absicht der Erzählung, die die davidische Dynastie als Werk der Führung JHWHs darstellt, nicht zuletzt dadurch, daß die Ruthgeschichte als "Vorgeschichte" der Entstehung der Dynastie Davids durch Anspielungen und Motivparallelen gezielt mit den Patriarchenerzählungen (besser: Erzeltern Erzählungen) als "Vorgeschichte" der Entstehung Israels parallelisiert wird.

4. Die meist vorgeschlagene Gattungsbezeichnung Novelle "is too broad and imprecise a term to describe the form of Ruth". Präziser ist "short story", die im Anschluß an E. F. Campbell als eine in Kunstprosa gestaltete Erzählung charakterisiert wird, die typische Figuren in alltäglich-profanem Kontext so darstellt, daß ihr Handeln im Hintergrund von Gottes Vorsehung geleitet wird. Sie hat ein doppeltes Ziel: sie will ergötzen und (historisch) belehren. Weitere atl. Beispiele der short story sind Gen 24; 38; 37-50; Ri 3,15-19; 4; Ijob 1-2; 42,7-17.

5. Die im Buch erzählte Verbindung von *ge'ulla* und Levirat gibt gesellschaftliche Realität wieder. Zum einen ist die forschungsgeschichtlich gegebene enge Verknüpfung der Ruth-Erzählung mit Gen 38; Dtn 25,5-10 aufzugeben, wodurch sich die von daher ergebenden Bedenken ohnedies erledigen. Zum anderen aber muß der Begriff bzw. die Institution des *go'el* viel breiter gefaßt werden als dies in der Regel geschieht.

6. Die theologische Quintessenz des Buchs Ruth läßt sich mit dem Negro spiritual "He's Got the Whole World in His Hands" zusammenfassen, denn: "it is a story about the firm, guiding 'hands' of divine providence at work in the world. Unlike other biblical books, however, that world is not

that of prominent religious, military or political matters; rather, it is the sphere of ordinary human affairs. In Ruth, divine providence resolves the three common human needs which hang menacingly above the story like a dark, forboding sky: food, marriage, and children" (63). Daß und wie die Rettung der Familie des Elimelech vor der drohenden Vernichtung schließlich zur Geburt Davids, des Königs Israels führt, ist die faszinierende Handlung, an der die Lebensmächtigkeit der *haesaed* JHWHs, der durch die *hæsaed* von Menschen wirkt, konkretisiert wird. "In sum, the book praises human *hæsed* shown to family and to God and promises that such acts will not go unrewarded. Further, both Boaz and Ruth model the truth that God uses the faithfulness of ordinary people to do great things" (66).

Über alle diese Punkte müßte und könnte eine differenzierte Diskussion geführt werden. Dies ist hier nicht möglich (vgl. jedoch meinen 1986 erschienenen Ruth-Kommentar in der Reihe ZBK, den der Verfasser nicht mehr berücksichtigt hat). Folgende Bemerkungen sind jedoch unerläßlich:

1. Der von H. herausgestellte enge Zusammenhang zwischen der Genealogie 4,18-22 und 4,11f. ist einerseits unbedingt zu unterstreichen. Andererseits bleibt festzuhalten: Die Erzählung läßt in ihrem Verlauf nirgends erkennen, daß sie auf David hin entworfen ist, geschweige denn auf die in der Genealogie kunstvoll durchgeführte Systematisierung der Geschichte Israels (darauf weist der Verfasser zu Recht S.21-23, 280-285 hin). Auch die Wünsche der Frauen in 4,14f. lassen keine Ausrichtung auf David erkennen. Ebenso wenig klingt in der Exposition 1,1-5 eine dynastische Komponente an. Im Gegenteil: Der Name "Juda" ist dort territorial gemeint, während die Genealogie implizit bzw. im Rückbezug auf 4,12 "Juda" als davidischen Stammvater voraussetzt. Diese und andere Beobachtungen führen m.E. zu der Hypothese, daß 4,11f.17-22 zusammengehören und auf eine "davidisierende" Bearbeitung der ursprünglich nicht auf David hinzielenden Erzählung zurückgehen.

2. Das Buch einer Frau als Autorin zuzuschreiben, ist m.E. leider zu schön, um wahr zu sein. Auch wenn die Geschichte in der Tat als Kritik an der Männerwelt gemeint war, bleibt die story noch so stark innerhalb des androzentrischen Denkens (Interesse an der patrilinearen Geschlechterkette, der "Sohn" als Problemlöser, die Entscheidung über das Schicksal der Frauen trifft eine reine Männergesellschaft "im Tor" usw.) befangen, daß die These unwahrscheinlich ist. Eine Frau hätte diese Geschichte anders erzählt!

3. Überhaupt nicht überzeugt mich die Argumentation, die zur Datierung des Werks in die Epoche Salomos führen soll. Die Problematik der Aufnahme von "Ausländern" in das "Volk JHWHs", die H. im Ruthbuch behandelt sieht, ist so in der Epoche Salomos religionsgeschichtlich schlechterdings nicht vorstellbar; dieses Argument spricht, falls man es akzeptiert, erst für die nachexilische Zeit. Ebenso ist die von H. vertretene Parallelisierung mit den Genesiserzählungen doch erst möglich, nachdem diese als "Vorgeschichte" Israels vorliegen. Wie immer man über das Alter der Erzelterntraditionen urteilen mag, als "Vorgeschichte" der Volksgeschichte

Israels sind sie in der vielschichtigen Form, in der H. sie voraussetzt, im 10. Jh. nicht denkbar. Ebenso ist die Genealogie mit ihrem Einsatz bei Perez sowohl, was ihre Form als auch, was ihre Figuren angeht, ein Produkt der nachexilischen Theologie — wie das Buch insgesamt!

4. Sowohl "Novelle" wie "short story" sind als biblische Gattungsbezeichnungen insofern problematisch, als sie aus einer anderen literarischen Kultur stammen. Daß freilich "short story" weniger allgemein sein soll als "Novelle", kann man nur behaupten, wenn man die neuere Diskussion über die "Novelle" nicht kennt (vgl. demgegenüber meinen Kommentar, 22-25). Eine Alternative wäre "weisheitliche Lehrerzählung".

5. Trotz der Bestreitung durch H. bleibt es dabei: Die Ruth-Erzählung kennt Gen 38 und Dtn 25,5-10. Daß der Erzähler sich sprachlich und konzeptionell insbesondere von Dtn 25,5-10 anregen ließ, zeigen mehrere motivische und wörtliche Übereinstimmungen, wenngleich auch die Unterschiede nicht übersehen werden dürfen. Aber die Verbindung von Levirat und *ge'ulla* ist *seine* erzählerische Konstruktion, durch die er an einem außergewöhnlichen Beispiel aufzeigen will, wozu der bereit sein muß, der die Todesnot eines anderen "lösen" will.

6. Die Skizze der theologischen Intentionen, die H. gibt, macht das grundlegende Dilemma seiner Gesamtdeutung sichtbar: Einerseits ist es eine "Frauengeschichte" und andererseits läuft alles auf David als König Israels zu. Einerseits arbeitet H. in der Kommentierung sehr eindrucksvoll heraus, wie die ganze Geschichte als Erzählung (!) in 4,16 zu ihrem geradezu lyrischen Abschluß kommt (vgl. besonders 265f.). Aber dann läßt er den "eigentlichen" Abschluß erst durch den Erzähler-Kommentar in der Genealogie geben. Ob das plausibel ist?

Natürlich verdiente der Kommentar auch eine Diskussion über viele Einzelpunkte. Wenigstens einer soll angesprochen werden, da er für die Gesamtdeutung wichtig ist: Daß in dem Relativsatz des Segensspruchs 2,20 nicht JHWH, sondern Boas das Subjekt sein soll, leuchtet mir (trotz des als Beleg zitierten Aufsatzes von B. Rebera) nicht ein. Die *inhaltliche* Parallele zu Gen 24,27 und die Frage, was die Aussage "der nicht ... entzogen hat" im Blick auf Boas überhaupt bedeuten könnte, sind immer noch starke Argumente für die *opinio plurium*, daß hier JHWH Subjekt ist. Dann ist mit 2,20 eben auf die beginnende Erfüllung der Bitte 1,8 angespielt. 2,20 gehört in den Zusammenhang, der dann über 3,14 nach 4,14 führt und insgesamt das Thema "Rettung aus dem Tod" expliziert. Wenn ich recht sehe, ist dies übrigens S. 279 auch die Meinung von H. selbst — im Gegensatz zu dem, was S. 186f. vertreten wird.

Die kritischen Bemerkungen dürfen und wollen aber nicht das Gesamturteil einschränken: Dies ist ein wichtiger, informativer und hilfreicher Kommentar. Er ist mit großer Sensibilität und Sympathie für das Buch und die darin erzählte Geschichte geschrieben. Es macht Freude, ihn zu lesen und hilft, das Buch Ruth mit Freude zu lesen!

Johannisstraße 8-10  
D-4400 Münster

Erich ZENGER

M. Timothea ELLIOTT, *The Literary Unity of the Canticle* (European University Series XXIII - Theology 371). Bern, Peter Lang, 1989. xiii-383 p. 14,7 × 21. SFr 81,—

Sr. Timothea Elliott's *The Literary Unity of the Canticle* is a slightly revised version of her doctoral dissertation. After a brief but comprehensive survey of scholarship as it pertains to the question of unity, the body of her work consists of a painstaking sequential study of the Song, emphasising those elements that unify individual passages and the work as a whole, such as verbal and thematic repetitions. The last chapter draws these threads together: the Song, according to Elliott, consists of four parts, 2,8-3,5; 3,6-5,1; 5,2-6,3; and 6,4-8,4, with a prologue (1,2-2,7) and an epilogue (8,4-14). Each part has correspondences with each of the others; links, however, are especially strong between Parts I and III, and between II and IV. In addition, overall unifying factors are i) the theme of love; ii) dialogic form; iii) the preponderant role of the woman; iv) what Elliott calls the "mirroring" effect, the tendency for a statement concerning one partner in one part of the poem to be echoed in relation to the other partner in another part of the poem.

Recent scholarship on the Song has tended to move away from the question of poetic unity: one thinks of Hans-Josef Heinevetter's attempt to regard the Song as a "programmatic composition", whose unity is the work of a redactor working with multifarious material (*Das Hohelied als programmatische Komposition* [Frankfurt 1988]); Michael Fox's argument that the Song is a literary unity, though only very loosely structured, and that it may be the product of multiple authorship, or Zersingen (*The Song of Songs and the Ancient Egyptian Love Songs* [Madison 1985] 218-224); my own attempt to propose quite an elaborate structure for the Song while putting into question the very notion of poetic unity (*Paradoxes of Paradise* [Sheffield 1983]); and, more recently, Othmar Keel's recent commentary (*Das Hohelied* [Zurich 1986]), which, while adopting, very traditionally, the model of the Song as an anthology loosely stitched together through catchwords, grants a profoundly unifying context in the erotic art and poetry of the Ancient Near East, and indicates frequently the interconnections between the different parts.

Elliott suggests as her "working definition" of poetic unity an organic interdependence of each of the parts, on many levels. "The poem not only has a structure, it is a structure" (33). This unity manifests itself primarily through repetition and refrain. Organic unity needs to be demonstrated, however, not through simple repetition, but through argument: in what way does a particular reference develop and alter our perceptions of an image or situation, to what extent does it contribute to a whole that transcends its parts? The principal weakness of Elliott's analysis, exhaustive as it is, is that it does not do this. It presents us with a catalogue of repetitions, reflections, paradigms, that are for the most part disconnected from each other. Thus it would not effectively counter the argument from the anthological point of view that the repetitions and refrains of the song are the result of the homogeneity of the material, that the contents of traditional love poetry are indeed predictable.

A second limitation of Elliott's work is that it tends to gloss over contrast and elements conducive to disunity. This is noticeable, for example, in the analysis of the first part (2,8-3,5), where the extreme contrasts between the two subsections (2,8-15; 3,1-5) are subordinated to somewhat nugatory unifying factors, such as the advent of the male lover to the woman's house in 2,8 and 3,4, the beginning and conclusion of this section, respectively. Contrast is as powerful a structural determinant as similarity. Elliott's work would have gained greatly in dramatic tension if it had stressed this aspect of the Song.

Thirdly, the book is markedly lacking in its theoretical foundations. Elliott is impressively well-read in scholarship on the Song, but the only literary-critical work she cites is René Wellek and Robert Warren's *Theory of Literature*. Thus there is no trace in her book of any of the post New-Critical movements that have dominated literary criticism and, with it, literary criticism of the Bible in the last two decades. In particular, such developments as reader-response theory put into question the whole notion of an objectively independent text; the text is very largely the creation of its readers. Similarly, deconstruction, in its many forms, challenges the logocentricism of which the supposition of an ideal unity of an artistic work is one manifestation. It might substitute the model of an ever-differentiated but intricately interconnected web. Awareness of such approaches might have added greatly to the depth of Elliott's work, and granted it greater literary critical currency.

Fourthly, the book does not deal very much in interpretation. This results in a certain disconnectedness between structure and content, so that, instead of *being* a structure, whatever that means, the poem acquires one, "has" a structure. This is noticeable, for instance, in the treatment of the descriptive portraits of the lovers. Elliott considers the direction of the description, and classifies the imagery as pastoral, military, geographical etc. But she does not approach the question of metaphor, as the forced juxtaposition and identification of unlike terms, or examine its effect on the overall coherence and significance of the work. This is important, since one of the reasons for the experience of fragmentation in the Song is that it does violence to our sensibilities. The metaphors need interpretation, not only to perceive how they are interconnected at deep levels, but also for their effect on the overall integrity of composition.

Elliott divides the Song into four interrelated parts, with a prologue and an epilogue; Heinevetter discerns, instead, two parts, with a prologue and a late apologetic appendage; Exum found six matching poems; while I saw two counterpointing structures, one organised round a centre, the other building towards a climax. The multiplicity of competing structural schemes suggests ambiguity, and that no one interpreter is right. At the same time, the abundance of material offered to the structurally-inclined exegete makes Fox's scepticism at least premature. It is not that the Song is structureless, but that it suffers from a superabundance of structural clues. But this is a counterweight to the fragmentation and dissonance that make it a very difficult poem. Ultimately, we are not confronted with a choice between unity and multiplicity, but, as Heinevetter says (66), their mutual contribution to a tense equilibrium.

Alongside structural ambiguity, there is the impulse to perceive wholes, to organise our lives and our language. The difficulty of the Song of Songs is no greater than that of any other part of the Hebrew Bible. For example, there is the attempt, in the histories, to find meaning in Israel's experience, one that, according to David Clines, results in contradiction between Primary and Secondary Histories (*What does Eve do to Help?* [Sheffield 1990] 85-105). Closer to the Song is the very refractory structure and meaning of Qoheleth. The hidden tension in the Song is that whereas its climactic statement is that love is as strong as death, and its principal metaphor for the union of self and world is that of lovers, it is a displacement of that union through language, and through the obstacles it interposes between the lovers. They can only meet through metaphor, or outside the poem.

It would have added greatly to the interest and excitement of Elliott's analysis if she had looked more closely at the elements impeding or deferring unification. The writing is solid and workmanlike, if a little pedestrian; the range of reference is impressive. I would note, however, the omission of all consideration of the work of Othmar Keel or of Enrica Salvaneschi's *Il Cantico dei Cantici* (Genova 1981), in which the question of unity and multiplicity in the Song is examined very closely. S. F. Grober is assigned to the wrong gender. All in all, however, this monograph is a useful contribution to the ever-growing body of scholarship on the Song.

University of Alberta  
Edmonton, Alberta  
Canada T6G 2B4

Francis LANDY

Bruce K. WALTKE—M. O'CONNOR, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 1990. ix-765 p.  
21,5 × 26. \$37.50

As the preface states, this textbook has a twofold purpose: firstly, to serve as an introduction to the study of Biblical Hebrew syntax at the intermediate level and, secondly, to introduce its users to the vast array of scholarly discussion in this area. After an eighty-page introduction containing mostly a discussion on grammatical concepts and terminology, this textbook presents the syntax of nouns (83-252), the other nominals (adjectives, numerals, various pronouns, 255-340), the verbal stems (qal, niph'al, etc., 343-452), the verbal conjugations (tense, mood, aspect, 455-631), and the interclausal syntax (subordination and coordination, 632-673). Part of the strength of this book lies in its application of modern linguistics to the study of Hebrew syntax. Yet, the authors make this textbook accessible also to readers who are not very familiar with modern linguistics by keeping the format of presentation close enough to traditional grammars. Numerous Hebrew examples together with facing translation make this textbook easier to use than others.



The treatment of verbless clauses follows F.I. Andersen's categories, i.e., 'clause of identification' (the predicate *follows after* the subject, stating its identity, e.g., *'ānī YHWH*) and 'clause of classification' (the predicate *precedes* the subject, stating the group to which the subject belongs, e.g., *tāmē' hū' 'he is unclean'*). The authors have also given due consideration to critical discussion on Andersen's categories by pointing out that the preceding context, especially a contrastive one, may affect word order (8.4.2c-e, p. 133). Nevertheless, the discussion in 8.4.2f has not dealt with verbless clauses whose basic form is Noun Phrase + Prepositional Phrase (or the reverse order) in a satisfactory way. The following consideration may be useful for further investigation. Example #28 on p. 135 exhibits an indefinite NP followed by a PrepP: (context: 'He [= Esau] is coming to meet you [= Jacob]') *wē'arba 'a-mē'ōt 'iš 'immô* 'And there are four hundred men with him' - Gen 32,7. Then in Gen 33,1, quoted in #31, one has (context: 'Esau was coming') *wē'immô 'arba'a-mē'ōt 'iš* 'and the four hundred men were with him' (translation mine). The former is an "existential" clause and has an indefinite NP. The latter is a "locative" clause and exhibits a definite NP (in this case, by anaphora). In existential clauses the NP *invariably precedes* the PrepP. Locative clauses have more freedom as is clear from #31-32 (PrepP + NP<sub>def</sub>) alongside ##29-30 (NP<sub>def</sub> + PrepP). The word order in locative clauses seems to correlate with the need to express cohesion or shift of focus. Thus the PrepP *'immô* in #31 above stands at the beginning of the clause to build a cohesion with the preceding context ('Esau'). A very instructive example is found in Lev 13,45-46 (mentioned in note 20, p. 134). In v. 45 the PrepP *bô* occupies the first position in the clause to express cohesion with 'the leper' mentioned in the preceding context: ('the leper' *'āšer*) *bô hannega'* '(who) has the affliction'. But in v. 46 the focus of attention moves to the affliction itself and hence the NP<sub>def</sub> now precedes the PrepP: ('all the days' *'āšer*) *hannega' bô*. This reviewer has made further observation along that line in *Word Order Variation in the Akkadian of Byblos* (StudPohl 15; Rome 1990) 37-67.

Any discussion on verbless clauses will necessarily rely on the concept of definiteness/indefiniteness of nouns. Whereas older grammars limit their treatment of definiteness to the use or non-use of the definite article, this book includes a discussion on deixis, anaphora, referential features, and other syntactic constructions which make a noun definite (235-252). This is indeed a great improvement on past works. Nonetheless, it should be noted that the concept of definiteness is a graded concept, ranging from the more definite (such as deixis, anaphora) to the less definite (referentiality, syntactically definite terms). The following scale of definiteness may reflect the situation: deixis > anaphora > referentiality > syntactically definite terms.

The presentation of debated issues is balanced and informative. This is extremely useful for students who wish to enter into much-disputed areas like the origin, meaning and use of verbal conjugations. The critical survey of various theoretical positions concerning this matter given in Chapter 29 ends with the following observation: "The studies considered so far suggest that the basic structure of the system, though it allows for time reference, is

aspectual" (475). Hence one gets the following picture: *qatal* has a perfective aspect, i.e., a verbal conjugation that expresses a situation as a whole (not necessarily a completed one), in contrast to *yiqtol* which describes an ongoing process or the imperfective aspect without specific time-reference; *wayyiqtol* and *w<sup>e</sup>qatalti* are relative tenses that express the consequence of a situation described in the preceding clause. Various competing theories to explain the origin, meaning and use of the individual conjugations are presented and evaluated at the beginning of Chapters 29-33. In describing these individual conjugations, the authors rather surprisingly follow the traditional practice of enumerating various shades of their meaning. Thus *qatal* is said to be a verbal form which "may refer to any block of time, past, present, or future" and has the following range of meanings: preterite, ingressive, constative, telic, gnomic/proverbial, persistent, instantaneous, epistolary, perfective of resolve, accidental, prophetic perfect, and precative. Yet most learners will find these labels helpful only after they have understood the meaning of the particular cases of *qatal*. A more context-sensitive approach would have been more useful.

Insights from discourse grammar might help to clarify the problems concerning the use of verbal conjugations. Many would agree that, whereas *wayyiqtol* marks the storyline of a narrative, the non-initial *qatal* and the initial *w<sup>e</sup>yiqtol* give various kinds of background information to the storyline. In speech the situation is different. Here *yiqtol* is predominantly used in the present-future sense. This discourse grammar approach has been used in introductory grammars by W. Schneider, H.-P. Stähli, as well as in special studies by W. Richter, W. Gross and A. Niccacci. Recently R.E. Longacre has also shown that the various types of discourse (i.e., narrative, hortatory, expository) correlate differently with verbal conjugations and thus reveal the use of the latter.

The authors present the best results of modern studies on the form, meaning, and use of verbal stems, i.e., qal, niphil, piel, etc., in nine full chapters (Chapters 20-28). These are also the most useful parts of the book. Among the new insights to be found in this book are the ergative sense of niphil (23.2.1b, #5b *w<sup>e</sup>lō' yē'ākēl 'et-b<sup>e</sup>šārō* 'Its flesh [with 'et!] shall not be eaten'), the frequentative hitpael (26.1.2b, #1 *wayyitgā'āšū w<sup>e</sup>lō' yūkālū* 'Although [its waves] batter continuously, they cannot prevail'), and the modal senses of hiphil, such as the one expressing compulsion (27.5b, #1 *'āhāh bittī hakrēa' hikra'tīni* 'Alas, my daughter, you have brought me to my knees'). Yet the idea of compulsion seems to come from the infinitive absolute *hakrēa'* rather than from *hikra'īi*. The only clear modal sense of hiphil is perhaps the permissive hiphil, e.g., #4 *hōdīa' 'elohīm 'ōtka'* 'God let you know'.

The impact of discourse grammar is felt in the treatment of subordination (632-646; especially the different levels of *w<sup>e</sup>*, 634f) and coordination (647-673). The authors start by stating the position of the clause in a larger unit according to the Masoretic textual divisions. The treatment of coordination given in this book has carried further the excellent but rather compact presentation in Lambdin. In dealing with the conjunctive-sequential

waw vs. disjunctive waw (39.2.2-3, pp. 650-652) the authors unfortunately fail to observe that the position of the verb and the type of clause introduced by the waw play an important diagnostic role. In clauses introduced by conjunctive-sequential waw the verb takes the initial position, in clauses introduced by disjunctive waw it is non-initial. All examples quoted in this section clearly show such a distribution. The conjunctive-sequential waw also requires a verbal clause, a condition that is not required by the disjunctive waw.

The authors adopt a functional view of adverbs rather than using the notional approach of traditional grammar. Thus three classes of adverbs are presented: clausal adverbs (modifying the whole clause), item adverbs (modifying single words), and constituent adverbs (modifying the predicates). The first two of these are mostly particles, the third also includes verbal and nominal forms. This last class of adverbs is usually called 'adjunct' in linguistic literature.

The twenty-page bibliography with its more than a thousand titles includes the most important works on post-biblical Hebrew, other Semitic languages, general linguistics and literary studies. But significant studies published in Modern Hebrew, such as articles appearing in *Leshonenu*, are barely mentioned; for these, readers will need to consult N. Waldmann, *The Recent Study of Hebrew* (Winona Lake 1989) cited in the bibliography on p. 710. The glossary of linguistic terms on pp. 689-694 provides a great help to the general reader for whom terms such as *anarthrous*, *ergative*, *deixis*, *telic*, etc., may be new. Both authors and publishers deserve our thanks for this finely produced textbook. What is still needed is a workbook to accompany this volume.

Pontifical Biblical Institute  
Via della Pilotta 25  
I-00187 Roma

Agustinus GIANTO

Mats ESKHULT, *Studies in Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique in Biblical Hebrew Prose* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis — Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 12). Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1990. 142 p. SEK 108,—

The monograph is another workout of the aspect doctrine cultivated by Rundgren. "Aspect" is "the essentially subjective way a speaker looks upon a situation" (9; also 28). After a brief introduction (chap. 1), the theory of aspect is set out in chap. 2. Various kinds of verb formation are discussed, and syntactic factors bearing on verb aspect are recognized. The intention to distinguish dialogue from narrative is announced. There is a good summary of the main thesis on p. 101. Chap. 3 studies the "episode marginal" use of "circumstantial" (*w<sup>e</sup>*)*subj-qatal* clauses in two texts —

the Mesha Inscription and the Elijah-Elisha cycle. Chap. 4 continues the investigation on a larger scale in two more texts — 2 Sam 13–20 and Judg 6–8 (with Judg 6 in detail, with synoptic display of the Hebrew text and English translation along with a running commentary with various textual and exegetical notes as well as text-linguistic discussion relevant to the main thesis). Chap. 5 examines the usage in Late Biblical Hebrew; Eskhult did not explore the latter himself, but merely drew on the work of other scholars, notably Polzin. His summary of twenty significant features (106–109) is useful, none of them includes verb aspect or clause type as studied in the first 102 pages of the book, so no comparison is possible. Chap. 6 summarizes the conclusions.

The treatment is driven by a theory of aspect understood not as *Aktionsart* (“the intrinsic mode of action” [18]), but as the way in which a “situation” is perceived and presented by an author, whether as “action” or “state”. The preferred means for securing this distinction derives from the historical *qatal* (verbal noun for state) and *yqtl* (verb of action, with a range of forms and referents and a complex evolution). *Aktionsart* is dealt with in one brief and rather vague paragraph as “grammaticalized” in the *binyanim* (the term “lexicalized” would have been better, but the matter is not pursued).

Although “aspect” is seen primarily as a “value given to a verbal form” (17), the approach shows that aspect is really a property of a whole clause (17, 28). This is a most important theoretical and methodological advance. Another insight, implicit and not worked up into a theory of text cohesion (this seems to be what Eskhult means by “contextualizing” [14] or “contexturizing” [17]), is the determination of the aspect of any clause by constraints from other clauses with which it is connected in larger discourse. In this connection the use or non-use of *w<sup>e</sup>*- to coordinate a clause is enormously significant; but Eskhult’s continual (*w<sup>e</sup>*)*subj-qtl* treats asyndeton as indifferent. Vague appeals to “context” are not enough to bring these factors under rigorous control. Even so, Eskhult affirms that aspect is a device “used by a speaker (or writer) in order to guide his audience through a text” (9; also 11, 17, 35, 40); but, apart from dividing stories into “episodes”, he does not map the hierarchical structure of whole stories. (Longacre’s study of the Joseph story is a splendid example of the benefits of such an approach, but it was not available to Eskhult in time.)

A fundamental distinction is made between the functions in classical discourse of two kinds of clauses, generally characterized as “foregrounding” (typically *wayyiqtol* reporting an action) and “backgrounding” (typically (*w<sup>e</sup>*)*subj-qatal* reporting a state). In the narrative prose texts which are the main object of study the ubiquitous *wayyiqtol* type of clause reports a succession of events (foregrounded actions) called the “thread”, “chain” (40), “skeleton” (14, 40, 43), or “sequential narrative event line” (17, 40, 43). “Each clause marks one successive event” (59). Other types of clauses, grouped under the Arabic label *ḥal* (11, 31), are “supportive elements” (35), “extra information” (39), “beside the event line” (43). This familiar point is continually made and amply illustrated.

At different places in the book different explanations are given of how “episode marginal” clauses work. The fronting of the subject in a (*w<sup>e</sup>*)*subj-qatal* moves the verb away from clause-initial position, interrupting the chain of *wayyiqtol* clauses and putting the “circumstantial” clause beside the main chain. But it is not sufficiently recognized that other items besides the subject placed before the verb achieve the same effect in the chain of discourse (as do clauses with other kinds of verb), and that the range of options for the fronted item and/or verb permits fine tuning of the result. A schema in which all actions are foregrounded and all states are backgrounded is too wooden.

Numerous relationships of the marginal clause to the main thread are thus possible:

*Onset* — A clause other than a *wayyiqtol* clause may mark the initiation of a fresh episode (50) (or “scene”, as it is sometimes called [examples on p. 67]). It is a “device of commencing a new thread” (49). But Eskhult does not recognize that such a clause can also report the first event in the new episode (*on* the event line, as with 1 Kgs 20,23, not *off* it as he says of 1 Kgs 20,1 on p. 52). It is used to mark “a shift of topic and scene” (23, 37, 67), the state of affairs when the new action sets in (55); “not to introduce a new fact” (42), only “the prevailing state of affairs” (55). This interpretation arises from Eskhult’s insistence that *qatal* always reports a state, never an action. The *qatal* clause “is not even used to open paragraphs” (22).

*Interruption* (33) — not to put a bit of information beside the main thread, but to backtrack (“anteriority” [34]) or recapitulate (65). On p. 36 Exod 19,3 is translated into English as a flashback rather than as onset of a new episode, as if Moses “had gone up” to God before Israel camped. When such an interruption inserts a little story parenthetically, we need to know when the insertion ends and we return to the main thread.

*Retardation* (66) — to slow down the pace or hold a scene for a while. Eskhult calls 2 Sam 18,18 “a retarding remark”.

*Resumption* — of narrative after a parenthesis (54). The difference between this case and onset of a new episode may not be clear cut; it depends on how one reads the pragmatics. Thus the (*w<sup>e</sup>*)*subj-qatal* clause in 2 Sam 13,38 “starts the new episode” (60, n. 1); but the same note says that vv. 37-39 are “an interlude between two episodes”. When a (*w<sup>e</sup>*)*subj-qatal* clause is followed by one or more *wayyiqtol* clauses such a chain of successive events constitutes a story, however long or short. If it is a digression (98) or an interpolation, resumption is a flash-back to the point where the previous thread was interrupted.

*Close-out* — 2 Sam 18,9bβ.17b are good examples, recognized by Eskhult as “rounding off” or “concluding” an episode (66). But the same expression (“rounds off”) is used on p. 34 to describe a clause that is not episode-terminal, but chiastically integral to the preceding clause. In any case close-out clauses do not report mere circumstance or background (“off the event line” [66]); the last *event* in the episode is when the mule runs away (2 Sam 18,9bβ); verse 10 introduces a new participant to begin a new episode. On p. 59 a *w<sup>e</sup>-qatal* clause (2 Sam 13,18b) is said to “round off” a scene in which closing the door is actually the last event.

*Backgrounding* — “circumstances that accompany the main event line” (18), said to be “fairly common” (32). *Qatal* is not the only form of predicate recognized in clauses with this function. Participial and even verbless clauses act similarly.

*Chiastic* (22) — a rhetorical pattern whereby “two clauses are incorporated side by side into the narrative chain” (70). Eskhult does not always distinguish this case from the classical “circumstantial” clause *beside* the narrative chain.

*Delimitation of scenes* (9, 37) — The parade example in Judg 6,19-21 is discussed on pp.86-89. Here we meet the grammar of the paragraph as a linguistic unit. To recognize that a (*w<sup>e</sup>*)*subj-qatal* clause breaks a chain of *wayyiqtol* clauses and so marks episode boundaries is only a first step. The (*w<sup>e</sup>*)*subj-qatal* clause of onset, interruption and resumption *begins* a new piece of text, however long; in close-out it ends a unit. And all these are different from the strictly circumstantial clause which stands beside the event line *within* a paragraph.

With the same clause-clause transition (*wayyiqtol* followed by *w<sup>e</sup>-X-qatal*) having so many possible discourse functions, more is needed than just a list of these functions distinguished intuitively (or, worse, derived from preferred English translations). We need to identify the constraints, formal or pragmatic, which distinguish one function from another. In particular, there is a big difference, in terms of the syntax of the paragraph as such, between clauses whose function is to mark paragraph boundaries (onset and close-out), and those which are inside a paragraph. And on top of that there are two possible readings of each such clause. Within a paragraph a “circumstantial” clause may be integral (chiastic) or marginal. It is contradictory to talk about “a clear scene- and topic shifting *circumstantial* [my emphasis] function for the sequence *subj-qtl*” (12). At onset the *w<sup>e</sup>-X-qatal* clause could be only a lead-in, setting the scene, or it could already plunge into the first event. A close-out clause could be a climactic final event or simply a fade-out. And a clause might have more than one discourse function in its linguistic context. A chiastic clause proper cannot be paragraph initial, but it could present two concurring actions at the end of an episode. Perhaps a *w<sup>e</sup>-X-qatal* clause could be transitional, marking both the end of one episode and the beginning of the next. Eskhult recognizes Judg 6,33-35 as “both recapitulative and anticipatory” (73).

The optimal signal of transition from one episode to the next would be the use of either the high-level transition marker *way<sup>e</sup>hi* or *w<sup>e</sup>hayâ* (30) or else of two non-*wayyiqtol* clauses, one to end the last episode, one to begin the next. Less unequivocal would be the use of just one such clause. But more than just the pattern of such a clause would be needed to make its function clear, since such a clause can be used for either onset or close-out. Content could clear up this uncertainty; for instance, if in a *w<sup>e</sup>-X-qatal* clause “X” indicates a change of time or location, or introduces a new character, then the clause begins a new episode, and the preceding clause, by default, ends the preceding episode. On the other hand, if the content of a *w<sup>e</sup>-X-qatal* clause shows that it continues the preceding action and rounds

if off, then it closes the episode, and the next clause, by default, begins a new episode, even if it is a *wayyiqtol* clause.

The flip side of the nontypical use of “circumstantial” clause to mark some kind of fresh beginning is the use of *wayyiqtol* when the pragmatics shows that a new episode, even a new story, has begun, as in Gen 39,7b and Mesha line 14. 1 Kgs 20,27a.30b.33a have (*w<sup>e</sup>*)*subj-qatal* clauses not mentioned by Eskhult: the first shifts topic and scene; the others are chiasmic-contrastive presentations of correlative events.

### *Some Criticisms*

1) There is confusion in the use of the term “stative”. Sometimes it is applied to the aspect of verbs in suffix conjugation (“essentially stative” [23]); sometimes to the conventional wisdom that *qatil* and *qatul* vocalization distinguishes stative *verbs*; sometimes for any verb which expresses the “idea” of a state (26), whatever its morphology or vocalization. This leads to obscure, equivocal, or contradictory expressions.

2) Attempts to make the stative value of the suffix conjugation (“an inflected adjective” [21]) stand up in all its occurrences yield strained explanations of less amenable cases, such as “deliver” (85). On p.39 Eskhult asserts that Gen 37,20 (“a wild beast has devoured him”) refers to the present; but the similar “Pharao [sic] was angry with his servants” (Gen 41,10) can refer only to the past. Even more strained is Eskhult’s inference that *w<sup>e</sup>qatal* “perfect consecutive” (i.e., “future”) is strictly stative.

3) The relation of clauses called *ḥal* to the conventional “circumstantial” clause is not clear. Sometimes these labels are applied in a very general way to almost any kind of clause which is not part of the main thread of discourse, that is, not *wayyiqtol*. Clauses not *wayyiqtol* have many patterns and functions, and much more detailed analysis is needed to bring out the variety of presentations available to the Hebrew story teller.

4) It is not generally true, as Eskhult says, that “*subj-verb* clauses do not carry the action forwards” (39). The terms “circumstantial”, “backgrounded”, “concomitant”, “simultaneous” (chiasmic), “contrastive”, “antithetical” do apply to many such clauses which are “beside the event line” in these and other relationships.

5) The simple distinction between “foreground” and “background” is not nuanced enough to cope with the subtleties of story telling. The author has more options for staging the drama than these two.

6) Embedded clauses are not distinguished from backgrounded.

7) Particles that are said to “restrict” or “neutralize” the aspect of a verb (29) are really quite diverse in their syntactic functions — interrogative, negative, subordinated and relative clauses have quite different text-linguistic functions, and should not all be lumped together.

8) The intention is stated already on p.10 to distinguish the narrative (descriptive, declarative) component of a text from reported dialogue (“face-to-face conversation” [11]). This policy is not followed consistently.

9) There is undefined use of quasi-statistical terms: "exceptional" (32); "commonly" (24), "mostly" (26); "generally" (29, 32), without illustrative data in the form of counts or relative frequencies.

2600 Dwight Way  
Berkeley, CA 84704 USA

F. I. ANDERSEN

### Novum Testamentum

Alan P. WINTON, *The Proverbs of Jesus*. Issues of History and Rhetoric (JSNT Supplement Series 35). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1990. 236 p. 14 × 22. £25.00–\$43.50

This volume began life as a Ph.D. thesis at the University of Sheffield, England. It is an ambitious project: in effect, to integrate the wisdom teaching of Jesus with his teaching on the kingdom of God. But it never quite succeeds in achieving the necessary balancing act or a very high degree of integration and ends up falling between the two stools. What we have in fact is more like preliminary work done on two separate fronts; Jesus' wisdom teaching, and the kingdom of God in Jesus' message, with neither properly followed through and worked out or developed in sufficient detail. Indeed, what we have is almost six independent studies whose correlation is limited and suggestive rather than clearly demonstrated and elaborated. This impression is strengthened by the brevity of the introduction, and the absence of any final concluding chapters in which the preceding threads could be tied together into some sort of overall pattern.

Chapter 1, 'Aspects of Wisdom in the Synoptic Gospels', is a promising start. It looks like a clearing of the decks before getting down to the primary concerns of the thesis. It makes some good combative points on the question of whether we can speak of a Wisdom Christology in the Synoptics, concluding that there is no such explicit Christology, but that we cannot rule out the possibility that 'traditions' concerning the figure(s) of Wisdom may have been alluded to as a way of giving content to the significance of Jesus' mission. In commenting on the categorisation of Jesus as 'a wise man' the author wisely warns against any attempt to reduce the social identity of Jesus to one title. In more general terms he urges more caution in the use of the categories 'wisdom', 'tradition' and 'influence'. But the main pointer to what follows is the categorisation of 'wisdom sayings' in the Synoptics into four categories, with the indication that interest will be confined principally to the fourth category — descriptive sayings, or 'proverbial wisdom'.

Chapter 2 is basically an attempt to classify and analyze the proverbial sayings in the Synoptics, building particularly on the work of D. Zeller and of A. Dundes. The description of their work is full and raises expectation that this will provide the basis of a thoroughgoing thesis on the Synoptic material. All that happens, however, is a fairly bare analysis of the structure



of these sayings — as ‘sayings with primarily non-oppositional features’, ‘sayings with primarily oppositional structure’ and ‘mixed sayings’. The analysis demonstrates the complex structure of some of the Synoptic proverbial sayings, and the many basic oppositions which form the foundation of a significant number of the sayings. But beyond that the author seems uncertain what to do with his findings, suggesting simply that the implications may be worked out on the two different axes, sociological and literary. This is presumably an attempt to bridge forward into the following chapters, but the degree of actual integration is limited.

Chapter 3 sets out on a new tack — a limited review of recent history of interpretation of the subject. The first subject of review is naturally Bultmann, with some good critical points made on pp.65 and 67 (e.g. “When Bultmann speaks of what is ‘characteristic’ of Jesus’ message, he means what is ‘distinctive’”). The review then becomes somewhat complex, since the author finds it necessary to deal with W.A. Beardslee and J.D. Crossan both together and separately, with N. Perrin thrown in for good measure. The presentation of their views is for the most part clear. But the structure of the chapter is made the more confusing by the introduction of substantive discussion of some key issues within the review of these authors — issues, in other words, which could have provided the substance of other chapters, had Crossan and the others been set out as the springboard for a thesis on its own. The conclusions are not really drawn together at the end, and any forward thrust generated by the discussion of the chapter is diverted into a quite different topic forming the next chapter.

Chapter 4 is devoted to problems involved in any attempt to reconstruct the message of Jesus. It reads like an early working-paper in a postgraduate career, covering the well-trodden ground of the old and new quest, the impact of Schweitzer and the question of criteria of authenticity. The whole is not very well integrated, with the important contribution by E. P. Sanders introduced only in the concluding comments of the last two or three pages. The two most substantive points, that the presence of wisdom material in the teaching of Jesus might cause us to modify a purely eschatological understanding of the kingdom of God (112), and that a collection of proverbial wisdom involves a degree of inconsistency and incoherence, which in turn undermines any assumption of a simple coherence in Jesus’ message (114-115), emerge in the middle of the chapter. These look like two good thesis claims round which a doctoral dissertation could be constructed. But by this point we are more than halfway through the book, and neither of them is taken up or consistently developed.

With chapter 5 we swing back to a study of the functions/rhetoric of the proverbial sayings in the Synoptic literature. Again there is clear promise of good things to come: “we propose to show that one of the most fruitful sources for (a comprehensive account of the function of proverbial sayings) will come from recent work in linguistics” (128). Then follows an account of what the author calls ‘pragmatic analysis’ and a brief examination of six proverbial sayings or groups of sayings. What it seems to amount to is the recognition that proverbs will have a range of potential meaning, and that any particular force of a proverb will depend on the

specific context in which it is used (206, n.32). 'Pragmatic analysis', in other words, sounds like a fancy name for old-fashioned 'exegesis'.

Chapter 6 offers to provide some pointers towards a more positive evaluation of the place of proverbial wisdom in the Synoptics. But it soon becomes clear that the core issue is the relation of wisdom and eschatology, in interaction first of all with R. L. Jeske. It is clear from Jeske's discussion that wisdom, even if only 'mantic' wisdom, can be related to apocalyptic, but the old confusion between 'apocalyptic' and 'eschatology' obscures the point. Then follows a review of kingdom of God references in the Synoptics (though with no attempt to discuss the theme at the level of the speech of Jesus himself), with the conclusion that "none of the Gospels presents a coherent ideology of the Kingdom of God as God's final and eschatological act" (157). But once again, what looks like a good thesis to be worked out in full detail is, instead, simply presented after a rather cursory review of the material, and then followed up with a further sequence of claims which again need to be worked out and demonstrated by careful exegesis and argument but are not. For example, "the Kingdom of God is surely about God's closeness and involvement in human affairs" (158); "in much of Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom the *emphasis* is on human activity" (158 - my italics); and most tantalising of all, in the light of any overall thesis for the book, "it is thought [by whom?] that a theological or theocentric focus does more justice to the wisdom nature of much of Jesus' speech than an eschatological interpretation of the kingdom" (163).

All in all, then, it is a book which promises well, only to disappoint repeatedly. Issues and themes are proposed, several of which if followed through, developed, and discussed with detailed exegesis and debate, could each have resulted in a coherent thesis. But again and again we are left bouncing on the springboard and never quite take the plunge into a thoroughgoing treatment of any one theme. There is much helpful matter in the volume — some good reviews of other writers, some trenchant and insightful criticism, some careful analysis of texts. But what we have in the end has more the character of a 'suggestion' (or several undeveloped suggestions) than a 'thesis'.

University of Durham  
GB-Durham DH1 3RS

James D.G. DUNN

Craig L. BLOMBERG, *Interpreting the Parables*. Leicester, Apollos, 1990. 334 p. 15,2 × 22,7. £11.95

There are two basic theses which this fresh study of the parables seeks to establish: (i) the view that Jesus' parables can never have been allegories is wrong; rather, Jesus used his parables to make more than one point. (ii) The parables of Jesus are fundamentally authentic in giving us the teaching of the pre-Easter Jesus. Thus, in the first half of the book, Blomberg discusses general considerations to do with the place of allegory in Jesus'

teaching, as well as the value of form criticism, redaction criticism and other more modern literary approaches to the gospel texts, seeking to defend his theses in general terms about the multivalent nature, and the authenticity, of virtually all the parabolic teaching recorded in the gospels. In the second half of the book, Blomberg considers each parable in turn, bringing out what he sees as the points (plural!) that each parable is making and defending its inherent authenticity. A concluding chapter summarizes the theology reflected in the teaching of the parables.

I consider here Blomberg's two main theses separately (though at times, the issues are interrelated, as in instances where two evangelists offer different wordings and/or interpretations of a parable: if Jesus intended more than one point to be made by the parable, Blomberg argues that it is quite possible that different people picked up different aspects of the original, many-sided meaning). On the allegedly "allegorical" nature of the parables, Blomberg is surely right to protest against an over-rigid limitation of the meaning of a parable to one and only one point. So too Blomberg has some telling criticisms to make about some of the newer literary approaches to parable interpretation, especially about the alleged irreducibility of metaphor and claims about performative language as excluding any kind of propositional language (138 ff.).

Nevertheless, the actual "allegorical" interpretations offered by Blomberg of the parables themselves are often slightly bland and somewhat disappointing. It has become something of a stock critique of Jeremias' interpretation of the parables that they are just single theological generalisations without any clear indication as to why Jesus had to tell elaborate stories to make his point. Much the same could be said of Blomberg's interpretation. The single points of Jeremias have become two points or at most three points per parable, but they are still general theological statements which could have been made much more directly and simply. Further, any "allegorisation" is usually strictly limited to finding significance in the main characters of the parables. For example, the parable of the labourers in the vineyard is said to teach that (a) none of God's people will be treated unfairly, (b) some will be treated very generously, but (c) all are equal in the eyes of God (224). At one level, this might be said to make three points as opposed to the traditional single point; but it is hard to see if very much has been gained over and above Jeremias.

What one misses in Blomberg's analyses is some deeper sensitivity to the overtones and undertones of meaning which some details in the stories might carry. For example, the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven have features which almost cry out for some kind of "allegorical" interpretation: the mustard seed becoming a cedar tree, the seed sown in an (illegal) garden (at least in one version of the story), the immense size of the lump of dough, made out of "three measures", the leaven being "hidden", etc. Some of these are mentioned by Blomberg in his discussion of these parables, but merely to defend (or assert) their authenticity, and generally he contents himself by claiming that these parables have just one point, viz. that "the Kingdom will eventually attain to significant propor-

tions despite its entirely inauspicious outset" (284). At other times, too, Blomberg seems to get so carried away with his own agenda of establishing a multiple meaning that he seems to miss out on vital exegetical decisions. For example, he claims that the parable of the sower is allegorical and the various seeds represent different people and different responses (228). This is at one level quite plausible; but is such an account meant to be consolatory, for missionaries facing failure? Or admonitory, for hearers of the Christian message deciding how to respond? Or could one think of one meaning at the level of Jesus, and another for Mark? In terms of Blomberg's overall discussion, one might expect him to say that both meanings are intended by Jesus: yet he does not directly address the question at all.

It is, however, at the level of the second of Blomberg's main theses, the question of the authenticity of the parables, that more critical questions seem to arise, at least for the present reviewer. Blomberg is not content to allow a basic underlying Ur-parable to be traceable back to Jesus. Rather, almost every account of every parable in all three gospels is taken as authentic. And if at times there appear to be differing reports of a parable (e.g. the great supper or the lost sheep), Blomberg claims that these may be different parables that Jesus told at different times, or the same parable which Jesus told more than once with different emphases. Despite some hard-hitting attacks against aspects of form criticism and redaction criticism, this looks very much like special pleading to press a theory just a bit too far. At times Blomberg seems aware that his plea for authenticity cannot cover every report of every parable. He makes a distinction between the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus and the *ipsissima vox*: the *ipsissima vox* is Jesus' true message which is preserved faithfully, even if at times the actual *verba* have been changed slightly by the evangelists. Yet at times this distinction is pressed farther than many would accept as legitimate in defending the "authenticity" of an individual tradition. For example, in Luke 5,32, Luke's addition of εἰς μετάνοιαν is accepted by Blomberg to be a Lucan addition, but claimed to be perfectly in line with Jesus' teaching on repentance elsewhere in the gospels (105). The latter point is debatable (references to "repentance" are not that common elsewhere); but the point here is surely that Luke's addition *has* changed the thrust of the saying significantly and altered its meaning. Both the Marcan and Lucan versions might have parallels elsewhere in authentic Jesus material; but both cannot simultaneously represent Jesus' own conclusion to this particular "parable" of the doctor being needed by the sick.

Elsewhere Blomberg quietly slips into a "meaning-significance" distinction to rescue his overall theory that the parables are authentic and true to Jesus' teaching. Thus he argues that it is quite legitimate to reapply imagery of a parable in a later situation (cf. 184, 193, 208). For example, Matthew's application of the parable of the lost sheep is a legitimate reapplication of the story to a new situation (183 f.). But it is hard to see how this is now different from the (by now) traditional redaction-critical approach. The latter would argue that much of the parabolic tradition has been reapplied in a later situation and adapted accordingly. Whether it is

“true” to Jesus is rather a different kind of question than whether it is simply reproducing Jesus’ original intended meaning in the original context (in so far as any of these are recoverable!). Indeed in this case, Blomberg can only succeed in making the Matthean version “true” to Jesus by quietly sliding over the possible change in referant in one of the main characters of the story: the shepherd is said to represent God, and yet for Matthew surely the parable is encouraging church leaders to adopt the role of the shepherd going out to search for the lost sheep, i.e. an erring church member. On any showing, Matthew has reapplied the parable to a totally new situation. By making the original “meaning” intended by Jesus rather vague and general, it is just possible to make Jesus’ meaning cover Matthew’s application. But the end result of Blomberg’s discussion is not so different from the by now classical parable studies he is ostensibly opposing. Jesus’s parables *were* used and applied in changed circumstances, and perhaps those reapplications are just as interesting as the “original” versions, especially for those without Blomberg’s confidence to be able to rediscover those originals!

The laudatory comment on the back cover of the book states that this may become “the standard evangelical textbook on the subject”. Clearly those of an evangelical persuasion will find much to agree with here. Those coming to the material with different presuppositions may well feel that too many problems are skated over rather too quickly and that uniformity is being imposed upon the tradition rather too blandly. Nevertheless, if Blomberg’s insistence that the parables of Jesus cannot be reduced to single aphorisms is taken seriously, then his book will be of service in opening our eyes to the immense potential of the richness of the parabolic tradition that has come down to us in the gospels.

University of Manchester  
Faculty of Theology  
GB-Manchester M13 9PL

C. M. TUCKETT

Volker HAMPEL, *Menschensohn und historischer Jesus*. Ein Rätselwort als Schlüssel zum messianischen Selbstverständnis Jesu. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1990. VIII-418 p. 15 × 22,5. DM 68,—

Die vom Verf. der wissenschaftlichen Öffentlichkeit vorgelegte Studie stellt eine mit großem Fleiß und starkem persönlichen Einsatz geschriebene Abhandlung dar, die die Ergebnisse einer Tübinger, von O. Betz betreuten Dissertation weiter ausführt. Läßt sich aus den Menschensohnworten, wie sie in den synoptischen Evangelien überliefert sind, auf das sog. messianische Selbstverständnis Jesu zurückschließen?

Dieses Problem ist seit Jahrzehnten in der Forschung strittig verhandelt worden. Meist pflegt man von der Annahme auszugehen, daß der Hoheitstitel in der jüdischen Apokalyptik vorgegeben war. Daher habe die

neutestamentliche Untersuchung bei den Sprüchen vom kommenden Menschensohn anzusetzen und ihnen dann die beiden anderen Gruppen vom gegenwärtigen sowie vom leidenden, sterbenden und auferstehenden Menschensohn an die Seite zu stellen. Bekanntlich sind in keinem Logion die drei unterschiedlichen Motivkreise miteinander verbunden. Daher neigt der sich allmählich herausbildende kritische Konsens zu der Annahme, die Sprüche vom leidenden Menschensohn auf die Gemeindetradition zurückzuführen und in jedem Fall die Ankündigung des kommenden Menschensohns als die älteste Überlieferungsschicht anzusehen — sei sie nun zum Bestand der Verkündigung des historischen Jesus zu zählen oder aber gleichfalls der Verkündigung der frühen palästinischen Christenheit zuzurechnen.

Der Verf. stellt sich mit bewunderswertem Mut der eben kurz skizzierten Auffassung entgegen und ist mit zäher Beharrlichkeit darum bemüht, verfestigte Positionen aufzulösen und neue Bewegung in die Beurteilung der synoptischen Menschensohnansprüche zu bringen. Dabei ist er von dem Interesse geleitet, nachweisen zu wollen, daß die urchristliche Rede von Jesus als dem Christus/Messias in Jesu messianischem Selbstverständnis verankert ist und deshalb als Entfaltung der darin gegebenen Voraussetzungen interpretiert werden muß. Wie versucht der Verf. den Nachweis für diese These zu führen?

Zunächst stellt er die Annahme in Frage, als sei für die Verkündigung Jesu bereits die Vorgabe einer ausgeprägten jüdisch-apokalyptischen Erwartung des kommenden Menschensohns in Ansatz zu bringen. Dan 7,13 f. werde der Menschensohn "mit dem eschatologischen Jahwevolk identisch" gesehen (32). Und die Vorstellung des Menschensohns, wie sie in den sog. Bilderreden der äth. Henoch-apokalypse entfaltet wird, sei vermutlich erst zu Beginn des 1. Jahrh. n. Chr. entstanden (41), habe aber inhaltlich nichts mit Dan 7 gemeinsam (44). Das würde bedeuten, daß die Erwartung des Menschensohns als kommender messianischer Gestalt noch nicht für die Verkündigung des historischen Jesus, sondern erst für die Zeit der urchristlichen Gemeinde als vorgegeben gelten kann — eine Konstruktion, die nicht ohne Mühe gewonnen ist. Denn es bleibt zu fragen, ob die in den Bilderreden ausgebildete Tradition nicht doch auf ältere Zusammenhänge zurückweist, die mit Dan 7,13 f. durchaus zusammengeesehen werden müssen.

Mit seiner kritischen Auflösung der vorchristlichen jüdischen Menschensohnüberlieferung sucht sich der Verf. den Weg freizumachen, um den in der synoptischen Tradition verwendeten Begriff nicht in einem bereits festliegenden Sinn, sondern als Rätselwort zu deuten, dessen eigentliche Bedeutung Außenstehenden verborgen bleibt und sich nur aus dem Gesamtzusammenhang der Verkündigung Jesu erschließt. Dabei verwirft der Verf. die meist vorgenommene Einteilung in die oben genannten drei Gruppen und nimmt seinerseits eine vierfache Gliederung vor, wobei jedes der Glieder gleichsam in das ihm folgende übergreifen soll: "1. Die Logien von der zukünftigen Hoheit des Menschensohns, 2. Die Logien von der gegenwärtigen Hoheit des Menschensohns, 3. Die Logien von der gegenwärtigen Niedrigkeit des Menschensohns, 4. Die Logien vom Leiden und von der Auferstehung des Menschensohns" (187).

In jeder dieser vier Gruppen meint der Verf., einen Kern authentischer Aussagen aufspüren zu können. Doch ließen sich die darin ausgesprochenen Inhalte nur mithilfe der Annahme zusammenschließen, Jesus habe im Verlauf seiner Wirksamkeit sein eigenes Selbstverständnis insofern abgewandelt, als er zunächst "die Annahme seines messianischen Umkehrrufs und Heilsangebots" sowie "seine Anerkennung als Messias Israels" erwartet habe (244). "Erst später, als sich Jesus dessen gewiß wurde, daß Israel wider alles Erwarten seinen Umkehrruf und sein Heilsangebot verwarf und dem Zorngericht Gottes entgegenging, tritt Jesu Todesgewißheit als Folge und Konsequenz des vorläufigen Scheiterns seiner Sendung zu seiner ursprünglich-primären Erwartung hinzu". (ebda.)

Schließlich soll es erst auf die Urgemeinde zurückzuführen sein, daß aus dem Rätselwort Menschensohn eine ausgeführte Lehre gestaltet wurde. Die Ostererfahrungen, die Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen und die Tatsache des leeren Grabes seien den Jüngern völlig überraschend widerfahren (365). Denn Jesus selbst habe damit gerechnet, daß in unmittelbarer Folge auf seinen gewaltsamen Tod die Gottesherrschaft offenbar werden solle (362 u.ö.). Was der historische Jesus in einem einzigen Geschehen erwartet habe, sei in der Theologie der Urkirche "aufgrund der geschichtlich notwendig gewordenen Differenzierung und Systematisierung in Auferstehung und Parusie in zwei verschiedene Ereignisse und damit zeitlich auseinandergerissen worden" (366 f.). Dabei habe dann die frühe Christenheit — anders als der historische Jesus — auf eine sich im zeitgenössischen Judentum gleichzeitig ausbildende Menschensohnerwartung nach Dan 7,13 f., zurückgreifen können (vgl. 156, Anm. 481; 186 u.ö.). Doch habe die Urkirche mit der von ihr ausgebildeten Rede von der Parusie des Auferstandenen und Erhöhten, formuliert auf dem Hintergrund des Ostergeschehens, in der Sache durchaus an der *ipsissima vox* des Menschensohns festgehalten und damit eine zutreffende "nachösterliche Aktualisierung der jesuanischen Ansage der heilsvollen Zukunft Gottes" vorgenommen (367). Mit diesen Thesen faßt der Verf. das Ergebnis seiner Untersuchungen abschließend zusammen.

Der aufmerksame Leser wird dem Verf. für seine scharfsinnigen Analysen, seine philologischen Ausführungen wie auch seine eingehende Auseinandersetzung mit der breiten Sekundärliteratur den gebotenen Respekt gewiß nicht versagen. Doch kann er nicht umhin, sowohl hinsichtlich der zum Ausgangspunkt genommenen Rahmenvorstellungen wie auch im Blick auf die Detailausführungen ständig mit Gegenfragen reagieren zu müssen. Nur einige können genannt werden, um beispielhaft anzuzeigen, daß es bei allem Verständnis für die engagierten Bemühungen des Verf. schwerlich möglich sein wird, ihm auf dem von ihm gebahnten Weg zu folgen. Zwar werden zu den Einzelexegesen vielfach bedenkenswerte Erwägungen vorgebracht; doch müssen auch hierzu ständig kritische Einwände angemeldet werden.

Die Bedenken beginnen bereits bei der zum Einstieg genommenen Behauptung, es könne nicht von einer in der Apokalyptik des vorchristlichen Judentums ausgebildeten Menschensohnavorstellung gesprochen werden. Selbst wenn man sich auf diesen Standpunkt stellen wollte, wird dann nicht begreiflich, wieso die Bezeichnung Menschensohn einen — wenn auch ver-

borgen gehaltenen — Hinweis auf messianisches Selbstbewußtsein andeuten könnte. Die These, Jesus habe den Begriff Menschensohn "als Chiffre für seine noch nicht offenbare Messianität und also Selbstbezeichnung des Messias designatus" benutzt (96 u.ö.), bleibt ohne Beweis. Bloße Vermutungen werden auch mit der Annahme vorgetragen, Jesus habe zunächst seinen gewaltsamen Tod nicht in Betracht gezogen; "denn in Übernahme alttestamentjüdischer Messiaserwartung sieht er nicht seiner Passion, sondern seiner Verherrlichung entgegen" (97). Hypothetische Konstruktion ist sodann das vom Verf. entworfene Bild, Jesus habe auf Grund der ihm entgegengebrachten Ablehnung von seiten Israels sein eigenes Selbstverständnis entsprechend abgewandelt. Zwar kann man die Möglichkeit erwägen, ob nicht tatsächlich der historische Jesus im Lauf seiner öffentlichen Wirksamkeit zunehmend mit der Möglichkeit oder auch Wahrscheinlichkeit seines gewaltsamen Todes habe rechnen müssen. Doch über Mutmaßungen kommt man dabei schwerlich hinaus.

Von ihm geltend gemachte Erwägungen nimmt der Verf. nur zu rasch für erwiesenen Tatbestand und erklärt: Menschensohn — in der ursprünglichen Bedeutung für "ich" (vgl. 198 u.ö.) — sei die Chiffre gewesen, "mit der Jesus seinen messianischen Anspruch rätselhaft verhüllt und zugleich andeutend zur Sprache bringt, Außenstehenden zunächst verborgen, ... den Seinen jedoch verständlich" (243). Solche Behauptungen können keine überzeugenden Beweise liefern — ebensowenig wie der Satz, nach dem Selbstverständnis Jesu sollten "die messianische Inthronisation des Menschensohns und der Anbruch der offenbaren Gottesherrschaft" zusammenfallen (362f.), wo doch das schwierige Problem gerade darin besteht, daß Menschensohnsprüche auf der einen und Ankündigung der kommenden Gottesherrschaft auf der anderen Seite nirgendwo in einem Logion der synoptischen Tradition miteinander verknüpft sind.

Sucht der Verf. in der Analyse der einzelnen Sprüche vielfach durch minutiöse Überlegungen Begründungen für die am Ende vertretene Gesamtschau zu gewinnen, so kann er — wie das zuletzt genannte Beispiel zeigt — dann plötzlich mit allzu schnell aufgestellten Behauptungen den Versuch unternehmen, komplizierte Problemzusammenhänge unkompliziert lösen zu wollen. Doch damit ist am Ende nichts gewonnen. Vielmehr bleibt bei aller Anerkennung fleißigen Nachforschens und engagierten Bemühens das grundsätzliche Bedenken, daß der Verf. sich mit der überaus schwierigen Thematik zu viel vorgenommen hat. Zwar hat er in den Analysen einzelner Logien hier und da durchaus bedenkenswerte Argumente vorgetragen. Auf das grundsätzliche Problem aber, wie sich die urchristliche Menschensohnchristologie zur Verkündigung des historischen Jesus verhält, hat er keine überzeugende Antwort geben können.

Ernst-Curtius-Weg, 7  
D-3400 Göttingen

Eduard LOHSE



Robert C. TANNEHILL, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts. A Literary Interpretation. Volume 2: The Acts of the Apostles.* Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1990. x-398 p. 16 × 23,5

This is the second volume of a two volume work by the Fred Gealy Professor of New Testament at the Methodist Theological School in Delaware, Ohio, USA. The first volume concentrated on Luke; this volume focuses on Acts.

In the history of Christian thought there have been three basic ways of approaching the Acts of the Apostles: (1) Acts furnishes the theological clue for reading the letters of Paul and the General Epistles (so the Muratorian Canon defending against Marcion ["the Acts of *all* the apostles"]) and modern Canonical criticism [e.g., B.S. Childs, *The New Testament as Canon* [Philadelphia 1984] 213-242); (2) Acts provides the historical context into which the apostolic letters of the New Testament can be fitted for proper understanding (so many scholars during much of the post-Enlightenment period); and (3) Acts is the second volume of a two volume work, Luke-Acts, and must be interpreted in light of the Third Gospel just as Luke must be read in terms of Acts (so Henry Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* [New York 1927] and his heirs). Tannehill belongs to the third group. In the two volumes of *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, one scholar not only treats both Luke and Acts but also interprets them as two parts of one whole.

Tannehill understands his two volume work as a commentary on Luke-Acts. This is as true for Volume One as for Volume Two. (This point is missed by Richard Dillon, *TS* 51 [1990] 513.) In I.6, T. says: "the discussion that follows is not simply an expanded reading; it is commentary". In II.8, he states: "This work is not a monograph but a new kind of commentary". Given its length and scholarly apparatus, it is a major commentary. In what sense is it a new kind of commentary? (1) It spends no time on typical introductory questions but moves immediately to the narrative of Luke-Acts. (2) It is concerned with Luke-Acts in its finished form (I.6; II.4), not with possible historical events that may lie behind it. It has no concern for sources, either in Luke (I.6, n. 3 — although T. thinks the two-source theory is correct, he regards it as irrelevant for interpretation) or Acts (II.4). (3) It works with large thought units, as these may be discerned from the narrative itself. Unlike Volume One where the focus of Jesus' developing relationships with significant groups necessitated movement through the story a number of times, Volume Two follows the text of Acts in a single movement from beginning to end. In this sense, it is more like a traditional commentary. (4) It *mainly* treats the literary work as a closed system and is concerned with how a particular passage functions within the larger narrative (II.5). Individual events are meaningful parts of a single story because they relate to an overarching purpose behind the whole, namely, the plan of God. As one might suspect, the dialogue partners who have the greatest impact on Tannehill's work are modern literary critics (e.g., R. Alter, W. Booth, G. Genette, W. Iser, L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, M. Sternberg, B. Uspensky). In all

of these traits, Tannehill's work fits into that stream of North American scholarship on Luke-Acts described in the review of his first volume in *Bib* 69 (1988) 135-138.

Several examples illustrate the method. (1) The repeated phrase, "the word of God increased/grew" (Acts 6,7; 12,24; 19,20) is best understood if read in light of Luke 8,4-15 where the word of God is the sower's seed. Numerous instances of such cross references are found throughout the book, oftentimes with great profit for the reader.

(2) In his treatment of Paul's speech at Athens in Acts 17,16-34, T. focuses on how the speech repeats themes already presented in Luke-Acts (e.g., 17,24's idea of God as creator is found also in 4,24 and 14,15; 17,24's present Sovereign is found also in 4,24.28; 17,24's God does not dwell in temples made with hands echoes 7,48; 17,25's rejection of idolatry repeats the theme of 7,41.43; 17,26's notion that all people are created from one picks up an idea already encountered in Luke 3,38; 17,30's emphasis on the need to repent of past ignorance echoes 3,17-19; 13,27, and Luke 24,47; 17,31's reference to Jesus as judge picks up the thread of 10,42). Thus a good share of the Athens speech repeats themes already presented in Luke-Acts. Such a reading of Luke-Acts as a closed system causes one to hear Acts 17 in a new way. At the same time, something precious is lost because the speech is not at the same time related to Jewish and Greco-Roman contexts.

(3) The "we-sections" are understood in terms of reader response criticism. "The anonymous "we" — a participant narrator — is a special opportunity for us and others to enter the narrative as participants and to see ourselves as companions of Paul as he prepares the churches for his absence and resolutely approaches the danger in Jerusalem. A first-person narrator is a focalizing channel through whom the story is experienced" (247). Again, this way of reading opens up a new way of seeing a familiar phenomenon. At the same time, something is lost if the "we" is not related to similar usage in Mediterranean antiquity.

(4) The end of Acts is read in terms of foreshadowing and fulfillment of a reader's expectations. From what has gone before, the hearers have been led to expect: (a) Paul would arrive in Rome (19,21); (b) Paul would bear witness there (23,11); (c) Paul would stand before Caesar (27,24). Since (a) and (b) have been fulfilled by the time one reaches chapter 28, one is led to expect that (c) will be also, even if it is not mentioned in the narrative. From what has gone before, moreover, the hearers would have been led to expect Paul's death beyond the end of the narrative: (a) in 20,25 the Ephesian elders were told that they would see Paul's face no more; (b) Paul's journey toward Jerusalem involved renunciation of his life in order to complete his course (20,24; 21,11.13-14); (c) Roman officials often follow expediency rather than striving for justice (24,26.27; 25,9). T. contends that the hearers would be led by such foreshadowing to expect that Paul did in fact appear before Caesar but that he lost his life. This, I think, is one of the most productive examples of T.'s method.

If T.'s stated method involves *mainly* treating the narrative of Luke-Acts as a closed system (5), looking for the interconnections among the

parts of the whole, and using modern literary theory to assist in making sense of what is found thereby, there is a good deal that falls outside the *mainly*.

(1) Normally, T. looks for not only links between a text and the rest of Luke-Acts but also links between Acts and the Jewish Scriptures. This would be expected in Canonical Criticism but goes beyond any treatment of Luke-Acts as a closed system. It is a productive move for an interpreter so why not include it in one's stated method?

(2) Occasionally, T.'s interpretation quite rightly involves reference to Greco-Roman sources (e.g., to Aristotle, *Ethics* 9.8.2 [1168b] — "The property of friends is held in common" — to make sense of the data in Acts 4,32-37). At other times, T. appeals to post-biblical Jewish sources (e.g., m. Sanhedrin 6.6, which forbids lamentation for one who has been executed, to make sense of Acts 8,2). Such cases, however, go beyond any treatment of Luke-Acts as a closed system. Since such comparative material is so helpful in these occasional instances, why not use it throughout where it can clarify what is otherwise unintelligible?

(3) There is even what looks like a rare inference about a dimension of the historical occasion of Acts (e.g., "Evidently magic was a threat of some importance" [161]) and an occasional claim about authorial intention (e.g., in the trial speeches Paul is being presented to Christians as a resourceful witness from whom other missionaries can learn [290]). Again, T. goes beyond Luke-Acts as a closed system.

(4) There are numerous hermeneutical assertions (e.g., although Acts supports a continuing mission to the Jews, "this emphasis does not mean that Acts reflects my own opinion about Christian mission toward Jews... I would not myself advocate a Christian evangelistic mission to Jews" [3]; regarding the community of goods in the early church, "We need not suppose that the narrator expected later churches to be transformed into the ideal community described. Such an expectation as critique of a complacent church with narrow vision, content with its own obedience, and this constructive criticism may find a response among individuals, if not in the church as a whole" [46]; regarding the early Christian belief in the sovereignty of God in the prayer of Acts 4, "The effort to control history by armies and nuclear weapons appears foolish if we believe in such a God" [73]). These examples indicate that T. needs either to clarify his statement of method or to restrain his movement outside it.

The concluding sentence of a recent survey of research on Luke-Acts since mid-century runs: "dissatisfaction with the way commentaries are written foreshadows a change of format in the future" (*The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters* [ed. E. J. Epp-G. W. MacRae] [Atlanta 1989] 312). T.'s two volumes offer a major commentary on Luke-Acts with a very different format from that of traditional ones. They will not likely be the last.

Wake Forest University  
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27109  
USA

Charles H. TALBERT

Susanne LEHNE, *The New Covenant in Hebrews* (JSNT Supplement Series 44). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1990. 183 p. 14 × 22. £27.50–\$48.00

La prépondérance du thème du sacerdoce dans l'épître aux Hébreux a souvent pour résultat de faire négliger les autres thèmes. La monographie de S. Lehne porte remède à cette situation en ce qui concerne le thème de l'alliance, qui occupe dans Hébreux une place très importante. Hébreux est en effet, dans le Nouveau Testament, le seul écrit qui rappelle explicitement la fondation de l'alliance du Sinaï (He 9,19-21), le seul aussi qui cite — et à deux reprises — le célèbre oracle de Jr 31,31-34 sur la nouvelle alliance (He 8,8-12; 10,16-17). Des 33 emplois du mot *diathēkē* contenus dans le NT, plus de la moitié — 17 — se trouvent dans Hébreux. Il était donc tout à fait justifié de consacrer à ce thème une monographie.

S. Lehne a le mérite de ne pas concevoir son étude de manière trop étroite. Elle observe avec raison que le thème de l'alliance peut être présent en des textes qui n'utilisent pas le mot et, d'autre part, elle se préoccupe de situer la doctrine de la « nouvelle alliance » exprimée par l'auteur de l'épître dans le contexte contemporain des conceptions juives et des attestations néotestamentaires. Elle s'emploie, en particulier, à analyser les ressemblances et les différences qu'on peut constater à ce sujet entre l'épître aux Hébreux et les manuscrits de Qumran. Les observations qu'elle en retire sont d'une perspicacité et d'une précision remarquables: à Qumran, on était convaincu que Dieu était déjà intervenu pour réaliser la nouvelle alliance; « les Qumranites s'estiment bénéficiaires d'une secrète nouvelle révélation, inaccessible à qui n'est pas membre de la communauté, révélation qui affecte profondément leur façon d'interpréter la Tora et les prophètes et qui gouverne en conséquence tout leur style de vie en tant que membres de la Nouvelle Alliance » (47). Le Maître de Justice « n'hésite pas à dire que Dieu a gravé sa Loi dans son cœur (1QM 4.10) » (52). La différence principale entre Hébreux et Qumran est qu'à Qumran, on n'a pas l'idée d'un sacrifice nouveau, pour fonder la nouvelle alliance, tandis que dans Hébreux, « la nouvelle alliance est présentée comme inaugurée, une fois pour toutes, par l'action définitive de la mort sacrificielle du Christ et son exaltation » (53). Cette observation exprime effectivement le point décisif.

Quoique moins approfondi, l'examen des textes pauliniens qui ont rapport avec le thème contient cependant des éléments intéressants. On comprend que S. Lehne ne se soit pas attardée à l'étude de ces textes, qui n'entraient qu'indirectement dans son sujet. Par contre, on est surpris de constater que les textes de l'épître aux Hébreux sont traités, eux aussi, avec rapidité: en 25 pages seulement. Il est vrai que plusieurs d'entre eux ont été pris en considération dans les chapitres précédents au cours de comparaisons avec d'autres textes. Le lecteur n'en reste pas moins sur sa faim. Il s'étonne de voir l'auteur se dispenser de toute discussion sur des points controversés et se rallier, purement et simplement, à telle ou telle opinion, en négligeant les autres. C'est le cas, par exemple, pour le sens de *diathēkē*: l'auteur se contente d'accepter la conclusion d'un article de J.J. Hughes (NT 21 [1979] 28-66), qui refuse la possibilité de plusieurs acceptions différentes et traduit

uniformément *diathēkē* par «covenant» dans Ga 3,15.17 et He 9,15-17. L'étude de J. J. Hughes — comme d'autres antérieures — a le tort d'ignorer les discussions sur le sens de *berit* et de proposer pour *diathēkē* un dilemme trop simple entre «alliance» et «testament». L'interprétation proposée par J. J. Hughes pour He 9,17 montre bien que sa solution est une impasse, car elle consiste à dire que l'expression «lorsqu'il vit» signifie: «lorsqu'il n'a pas immolé les animaux qui le représentent». On voit mal comment S. Lehne peut trouver convaincante pareille affirmation (125, n. 5). Elle se garde bien, d'ailleurs, de la citer explicitement, trouvant sans doute plus prudent d'exprimer une acceptation globale de la position de J. J. Hughes, sans entrer dans les détails. Mais comme il s'agit d'un point qui concerne directement le thème traité, ce genre de tactique n'est guère admissible. Un recours à l'étude d'Annie Jaubert sur «La notion d'alliance dans le Judaïsme» aurait été fort utile.

On peut faire des remarques analogues au sujet de «la tente plus grande et plus parfaite» de He 9,11 et de sa distinction d'avec «le sanctuaire» de He 9,24. Cette fois, S. Lehne se rallie à la position de P. E. Hughes dans *BSac* 130 (1973) 314. Constatant que l'épître applique à la «tente» et au «sanctuaire» des qualifications semblables, Hughes en conclut à l'absence de distinction entre tente et sanctuaire. Tout lecteur qui a quelques notions de logique formelle discernera sans peine le paralogisme qui sert de base à cette conclusion. Il suffit, d'autre part, de lire la phrase de He 9,11-12 pour voir qu'au contraire, l'auteur de l'épître distingue très clairement la tente et le sanctuaire; il affirme, en effet, que «*par* la tente» le Christ «entra *dans* le sanctuaire». Parce qu'elle suit aveuglément P. E. Hughes, S. Lehne déforme les affirmations de l'épître en disant que le Christ «entre dans la tente» (98) et elle omet ensuite toute mention de «la tente plus grande et plus parfaite» dans une liste des éléments caractéristiques du culte de la nouvelle alliance (98-99).

La brièveté n'est donc pas sans inconvénients. Elle présente aussi des avantages: l'ouvrage fournit de bonnes vues d'ensemble et se lit avec intérêt.

Via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00187 Rome

A. VANHOYE S.J.

# NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

## **International Conference on the Aramaic Bible**

The Consultative Committee on Biblical and Near Eastern Studies of the Royal Irish Academy has arranged to hold an International Conference in Dublin on Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, July 15, 16 and 17 1992 (with an opening lecture on Tuesday July 14) on the general theme "The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context".

Papers will be delivered by an international team of scholars and will treat of the Aramaic language, especially Palestinian Jewish Aramaic and the Aramaic of the Palestinian Targums; Jewish Haggadah and Halakah; Jewish tradition in relation to the New Testament, early Christian tradition and Apocrypha; the Samaritan Targum; early Jewish tradition and Qumran. There will also be daily symposia with members of the translation team on the various targumim (Torah, Nebi'im, Ketubim) and the "Aramaic Bible Project" (Michael Glazier-The Liturgical Press) now nearing completion.

As well as invited papers, it may be possible to include some shorter communications.

Enquiries to:

Dr Martin McNamara, M.R.I.A.  
1992 Conference Organiser  
Royal Irish Academy  
19 Dawson Street  
Dublin 2.

## LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

An dieser Stelle werden die für *Biblica* eingesandten Bücher verzeichnet. Eine Beurteilung ist damit nicht gegeben. Werke, die von der Redaktion nicht ausdrücklich erbeten worden sind, werden nicht zurückgesandt, auch wenn ihnen eine weitere Besprechung nicht zuteil werden kann.

Eingesandte Bücher und Artikel gehen an den Redaktor des *Elenchus of Biblical Bibliography* zur Anzeige nach dessen Gutbefinden.

Die Anschrift, an die wir die Sendungen zu richten bitten, ist: Schriftleitung *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, I-00187 Roma, Italien.

### Vetus Testamentum

**Barnes**, William Hamilton, *Studies in the Chronology of the Divided Monarchy of Israel* (HSM 48). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1991. xiv-186 p. 14 × 22,5. \$29.95 (\$19.95)

**Beaucamp**, Évode, O.F.M., *Livre de la Consolation d'Israël*. Is 40-45 (Lire la Bible 93). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1991. 255 p. 11,5 × 18. FF 95

**Conrad**, Edgar W., *Reading Isaiah*. (Overtures to Biblical Theology). Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1991. xiv-185 p. 14 × 21,5

**Deiana**, Giovanni-Spreafico, Ambrogio, *Guida allo Studio dell'Ebraico Biblico*. Seconda edizione corretta ed ampliata. Presentazione di Jan Alberto Soggin. Roma, Libreria Sacre Scritture, 1991. 224 p. 17,5 × 23,5. Lit. 35.000

**Doorly**, William J., *Prophet of Love*. Understanding the Book of Hosea. Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1991. iv-138 p. 13,5 × 20,5. \$8.95

**Drazin**, Israel, *Targum Onkelos to Exodus*. An English Translation of the Text with Analysis and Commentary. Hoboken, NJ, Ktav Publishing House, 1990. xii-383 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$59.50

**Farmer**, Kathleen A., *Who Knows What is Good?* A Commentary on the Books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes (International Theological Commentary). Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdmans - Edinburgh, The Hansell Press, 1991. xii-220 p. 13 × 21. \$15.95

**Fokkelman, Jan P.**, *Narrative Art in Genesis*. Specimens of Stylistic and Structural Analysis (JSOT The Biblical Seminar 12). Second Edition. Sheffield, Academic Press, 1991. xvi-244 p. £15.00 - \$22.50

**Gilbert, Maurice, S.J.**, *Les Louanges du Seigneur*. Commentaire pastoral et spirituel des Psaumes du Dimanche & des Fêtes (Parole Vivante). Louvain-la-Neuve, Edime International, 1991. 542 p. 15 × 22,5. FB 1199 -FF 199

**Guinan, Michael D., O.F.M.**, *The Pentateuch* (Message of Biblical Spirituality 1). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1990. 138 p. 14 × 21,5. Hard-cover: \$12.95; soft-cover: \$8.95

**Hasel, Gerhard, F.**, *Old Testament Theology*. Basic Issues in the Current Debate. Fourth Edition. Grand Rapids, William B. Eerdmans, 1991. x-262 p. 14 × 21,5

**Hobbs, T. Raymond**, *A Time for War*. A Study of Warfare in the Old Testament (Old Testament Studies 3). Wilmington, Michael Glazier, 1989. 248 p. 14 × 21,5. \$15.95

**Licht, Jacob**, *A Commentary on the Book of Numbers (XI-XXI)* (Publications of the Perry Foundation for Biblical Research in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem). Jerusalem, The Magnes Press, 1991. xv-253 p. 15,5 × 23. \$15.00

**Matthews, Victor H. – Benjamin, Don C.**, *Old Testament Parallels*. Laws and Stories from the Ancient Near East. Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1991. vii-276 p. 15 × 23. \$14.95

**McEvenue, Seán**, *Interpreting the Pentateuch* (Old Testament Studies 4). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1990. 193 p. 14 × 21,5

**Noth, Martin**, *The Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSS 15). Second Edition. Sheffield, Academic Press, 1991. 156 p. 14 × 22

**Rosenblatt, Jason P. – Sitterson, Joseph C.** (eds.), *"Not in Heaven"*. Coherence and Complexity in Biblical Narrative (Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature). Bloomington & Indianapolis, Indiana University Press, 1991. vii-262 p. 16,5 × 23. Cloth: \$39.95; paper: \$14.95

**Salvesen, Alison**, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* (Journal of Semitic Studies Monographs 15). Manchester, The Victoria University of Manchester, 1991. xix-329 p. 16 × 24

**Soll, Will**, *Psalms 119: Matrix, Form, and Setting* (The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 23). Washington, The Catholic University of America, 1991. vii-192 p. 15 × 23



**Steinmetz, Devora**, *From Father to Son. Kinship, Conflict, and Continuity in Genesis* (Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation). Westminster, John Knox Press, 1991. 214 p. 14 × 21,5. \$15.95

**Tate, Marvin E.**, *Psalms 51-100* (Word Biblical Commentary 20). Dallas, Word Books, 1990. xxvii-579 p. 15,5 × 23,5

**Tournay, Raymond Jacques**, *Seeing and Hearing God with the Psalms. The Prophetic Liturgy of the Second Temple in Jerusalem* (JSOTSS 118). Translated by J. Edward Crowley. Sheffield, Academic Press, 1991. 311 p. 14 × 22. £30.00 (£22.50)-\$50.00 (\$37.50)

**Van Houten, Christiana**, *The Alien in Israelite Law* (JSOTSS 107). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1991. 200 p. 14 × 22. £22.50 (£18.75)-\$39.50 (\$29.50)

*Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 12. Esaias.* Fascicule 6. Is 14,13-22,5. Edidit Roger **Gryson**. Freiburg, Herder, 1991. 401-480 p. 24 × 31,8

*Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 12. Esaias.* Fascicule 7. Is 22,5-26,20. Edidit Roger **Gryson**. Freiburg, Herder, 1991. 481-560 p. 24 × 31,8

## Novum Testamentum

**Baslez, Marie-Françoise**, *Saint Paul*. Fayard, 1991. 440 p. 13 × 22. FF 150

**Bovon, François**, *L'Évangile selon Saint Luc (1,1-9,50)* (Commentaire du Nouveau Testament IIIa). Genève, Labor et Fides, 1991. 515 p. 17,5 × 24

**Buckley, Thomas W.**, *Seventy Times Seven. Sin, Judgment, and Forgiveness in Matthew* (Zacchaeus Studies). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1991. 102 p. 14 × 21,5. \$6.95

**Casalini, Nello, O.F.M.**, *I Misteri della Fede. Teologia del Nuovo Testamento* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 32). Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 1991. 772 p. 16,5 × 23,5. \$65.00

**Collins, Raymond F.**, *John and His Witness* (Zacchaeus Studies). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1991. 112 p. 14 × 21,5. \$6.95

**Donfried, Karl P. (ed.)**, *The Romans Debate. Revised and Expanded Edition*. Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1991. LXXII-372 p. 16 × 23,5. £18.95

**Ebner, Martin**, *Leidenslisten und Apostelbrief*. Untersuchungen zu Form, Motivik und Funktion der Peristasenkataloge bei Paulus (Forschung zur Bibel 66). Würzburg, Echter Verlag, 1991. xvi-414 p. 15,5 × 23,5. DM 56, — ÖS 436,80

**Fischer, Bonifatius**, *Die lateinischen Evangelien bis zum 10. Jahrhundert*. IV. Varianten zu Johannes (Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel 18). Freiburg, Herder, 1991. 48\*-569 p. 16,3 × 24

**Giblin, Charles Homer, S.J.**, *The Book of Revelation*. The Open Book of Prophecy (Good News Studies 34). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1991. 231 p. 13,3 × 21. \$14.95

**Harrington, Wilfrid, O.P.**, *The Jesus Story*. Dublin, The Columba Press – Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1991. 168 p. 13,5 × 21. \$9.95

**Johnson, Sherman E.**, *The Griesbach Hypothesis and Redaction Criticism* (SBL Monograph Series 41). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1990. vii-172 p. 15,5 × 23. Cloth: \$39.95 (\$24.95); paper: \$24.95 (\$16.95)

**Karris, Robert J., O.F.M.**, *Jesus and the Marginalized in John's Gospel* (Zacchaeus Studies). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1990. 119 p. 14 × 21,5. \$7.95

**Kealy, Seán P., C.S.Sp.**, *Jesus and Politics* (Zacchaeus Studies). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1990. 96 p. 14 × 21,5. \$6.95

**Kurz, William S., S.J.**, *Farewell Addresses in the New Testament* (Zacchaeus Studies). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1990. 134 p. 14 × 21,5. \$7.95

**Lemcio, Eugene E.**, *The Past of Jesus in the Gospels* (SNTSMS 68). Cambridge, University Press, 1990. xiv-190 p. 14,5 × 22

**Maillot, Alphonse**, *I Miracoli di Gesù* (Parola per l'uomo d'oggi 8). Torino, Claudiana, 1990. 173 p. 15,5 × 21,5. Lit. 19.000

**Neiryneck, Frans**, *Evangelica II*. 1982-1991; Collected Essays by Frans Neiryneck (BETL 99). Edited by F. Van Segbroeck. Leuven, University Press, 1991. xix-874 p. 16 × 24. FB 2800

**O'Toole, Robert F., S.J.**, *Who Is a Christian? A Study in Pauline Ethics* (Zacchaeus Studies). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1990. 167 p. 14 × 21,5. \$9.95

**Scholer, John M.**, *Proleptic Priests*. Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews (JSNTSS 49). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1991. 243 p. 14 × 22. £30.00 - \$52.50

**Schweizer**, Eduard, *Il discorso della montagna (Matteo cap. 5-7)* (Piccola Collana Moderna, Serie Biblica 66). Torino, Claudiana, 1991. 144 p. 12 × 20. Lit. 16.000

**Stuhlhofer**, Franz, *Jesus und seine Schüler*. Wie zuverlässig wurden Jesu Worte überliefert? Giessen, Brunnen Verlag, 1991. 110 p. 12,5 × 18,5

**Sweetland**, Dennis M., *Our Journey with Jesus*. Discipleship according to Luke-Acts (Good News Studies 23). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1990. 261 p. 13,5 × 21. \$14.95

**Tambasco**, Anthony J., *A Theology of Atonement and Paul's Vision of Christianity* (Zacchaeus Studies). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1991. 115 p. 14 × 21,5. \$6.95

**Thompson**, Michael, *Clothed with Christ*. The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12,1-15,13 (JSNTSS 59). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1991. 292 p. 14 × 22. £30.00 (£22.00) - \$50.00 (\$37.50)

**Webb**, Robert L., *John the Baptizer and Prophet*. A Socio-Historical Study (JSNTSS 62). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1991. 446 p. 14 × 22. £35.00 (£28.00) - \$57.50 (\$42.95)

## Varia

**Addinall**, Peter, *Philosophy and Biblical Interpretation*. A Study in Nineteenth-Century Conflict. Cambridge, University Press, 1991. xii-330 p. 16 × 23. Cloth: £35.00 (\$54.50)

**Barth**, Markus, *Riscopriamo la Cena del Signore*. Comunione con Israele, con Cristo, e fra i suoi ospiti (Piccola Collana Moderna, Serie Biblica 64). Torino, Claudiana, 1990. 144 p. 12 × 20. Lit. 15.000

**Bilde**, Per – **Engberg-Pedersen**, Troels – **Hannestad**, Lise – **Zahle**, Jan (eds.), *Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom* (Studies in Hellenistic Civilization 1). Aarhus, University Press, 1990. 269 p. 17,5 × 24. DKK 211 - \$35.16

**Bowker**, John, *The Meanings of Death*. Cambridge, University Press, 1991. xii-243 p. 14 × 21,5. £16.95 - \$27.95

**Contreras**, Enrique, OSB – **Peña**, Roberto, OSCO (eds.), *Introducción al estudio de los Padres*. Período Pre-niceno. Azul, Editorial Monasterio Trapense, 1991. xxxi-325 p. 15,5 × 22,5

**Dahlberg**, Bruce T. – **O'Connell**, Kevin G., S. J. (eds.), *Tell el-Hesi*. The Site and the Expedition (American Schools of Oriental Research - The Joint Archaeological Expedition to Tell el-Hesi 4). Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 1989. xix-214 p. 22 × 28,5. \$42.50

**Daris, Sergio**, *Il Lessico Latino nel Greco d'Egitto*. 2a edizione. (Estudis de Papirologia i Filologia Biblica 2). Barcelona, Institut de Teologia Fonamental, 1991. 117 p. 16,5 × 23,5

**Felder, Cain Hope** (ed.), *Stony the Road We Trod*. African American Biblical Interpretation. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1991. xii-260 p. 15 × 23

**Grassi, Joseph A.**, *Children's Liberation*. A Biblical Perspective. Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1991. 128 p. 13 × 21. \$5.95

**Grelot, Pierre**, *Un Jésus de comédie augmenté d'un Paul de farce*. Lecture critique de trois livres récents. Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1991. 141 p. 13,5 × 19,5. FF 50

**Haag, Ernst**, *Vom Sabbat zum Sonntag*. Eine bibeltheologische Studie (Trierer theologische Studien 52). Trier, Paulinus-Verlag, 1991. viii-199 p. 16,5 × 23,5. DM 42,—

**Harvey, Anthony Ernest**, *Strenuous Commands*. The Ethic of Jesus. London, SCM Press – Philadelphia, Trinity Press International, 1990. viii-248 p. 13,5 × 21,5. £12.50

**Kaufman, Philip S.**, OSB., *The Beloved Disciple: Witness Against Anti-Semitism*. Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1991. 71 p. 13,5 × 21. \$5.95

**Kraus, Clyde Norman**, *God Our Savior*. Theology in a Christological Mode. Scottdale, Herald Press, 1991. 272 p. 15 × 23. \$19.95

**Lohfink, Norbert, S.J.**, *The Covenant Never Revoked*. Biblical Reflections on Christian-Jewish Dialogue. Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1991. v-96 p. 13,5 × 20,5

**Müller, Gerald**, *Johann Leonhard Hug (1765-1846)*. Seine Zeit, sein Leben und seine Bedeutung für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft (Erlanger Studien 85). Erlangen, Verlag Palm & Enke, 1990. v-292 p. 14,5 × 22. DM 46,—

ISSN 0006-0887

---

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

---



---

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

---

Finito di stampare il 13 dicembre 1991  
 Tipografia Poliglotta della Pontificia Università Gregoriana  
 Piazza della Pilotta, 4 – 00187 Roma